

STATES OF JERSEY

OFFICIAL REPORT

FRIDAY, 12th SEPTEMBER 2025

QUESTIONS.....	3
1. Urgent Oral Question	3
1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the experiences of a wheelchair user during a recent DFDS sailing (UOQ.3/2025)	3
Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):	3
1.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	3
1.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:	4
1.1.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	4
1.1.4 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:.....	5
1.1.5 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	5
1.1.6 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:.....	6
1.1.7 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:	6
1.1.8 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	7
PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption	7
2. Draft Residential Tenancy (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.24/2025) - resumption .	7
2.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:.....	10
2.1.1 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:.....	10
2.1.2 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:	10
2.1.3 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:.....	11
2.1.4 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:	11
2.1.5 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:	13
2.1.6 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:	13
2.1.7 Deputy M. Tadier:.....	13
2.1.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	15
2.1.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:	16
2.1.10 Connétable D. Johnson of St. Mary:	18
2.1.11 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:	19
2.1.12 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:	19
The Attorney General:.....	21
2.1.13 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:.....	22
2.1.14 Deputy K.F. Morel:	23
2.1.15 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central:	24
2.1.16 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:	25
2.1.17 Deputy T. Binet of St. Saviour:.....	26
2.1.18 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:	26

2.1.19	Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:	27
2.1.20	Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:	29
2.1.21	Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:	29
2.1.22	Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:.....	31
2.1.23	Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:	33
2.1.24	Deputy S.Y. Mézec:	34
3.	Draft Income Support (Parents, Children and Housing) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.59/2025)	37
3.1	Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):	37
3.1.1	Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:	38
3.1.2	Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:	39
3.1.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	39
3.2	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	41
3.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	41
4.	Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal: Appointment of Members (P.60/2025)	43
4.1	Deputy L.V. Feltham (The Minister for Social Security):.....	43
4.1.1	Deputy M. Tadier:.....	43
4.1.2	Deputy L.M.C. Doublet	44
4.1.3	Deputy L.V. Feltham:	44
	ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS.....	46
5.	Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):	46
	ADJOURNMENT.....	46

[9:30]

The Roll was called and the Deputy Greffier of the States led the Assembly in Prayer.

QUESTIONS

1. Urgent Oral Question

The Deputy Bailiff:

The first matter is an urgent oral question that Deputy Tadier will put to the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development.

1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development regarding the experiences of a wheelchair user during a recent DFDS sailing (UOQ.3/2025)

Was the Minister made aware of the harrowing case of a wheelchair user who was obliged to stay in his vehicle throughout a recent DFDS sailing from Jersey to the U.K. (United Kingdom) because he was told that the lift was already closed, does he accept that this situation was both inhumane and degrading to the individual in question and will he conduct his own investigation to understand what took place to make sure it does not reoccur?

Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (The Minister for Sustainable Economic Development):

I am grateful to the Deputy for raising this important issue. This incident was clearly unacceptable, and my officers raised it directly with DFDS as a matter of urgency on Monday, 8th September. By their express admission, this incident falls a long way short of DFDS's own standards, and those expected of them by the vessel flag state. DFDS has reached out to the passenger concerned and is reviewing the incident to find out why its usual procedures were not followed in this case. Furthermore, they have proactively reported this matter to the vessel flag state, given the deeply unsatisfactory passenger experience and unorthodox crossing. They are also shortly meeting with the Government's Disability and Inclusion Team to ensure that all passengers have access to the reliable and dignified experience that they rightly expect.

1.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier:

Is the Minister also concerned that this may be a breach of Jersey's anti-discrimination legislation, which has an underlying requirement to treat people with disabilities humanely but also to make reasonable adjustments for them so that they are not disadvantaged compared to other citizens, in this case other customers?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

As a politician, I am unable to suggest what may or may not be against the law but I can say that ... in fact I will read a message from DFDS themselves: "This was a bad mistake and we really let the customer down. We are changing our processes to prevent this happening again. The customer was correctly identified as needing assistance at checking in but was put in the wrong lane and was missed when we loaded vehicles which needed lift access." They say: "To be clear, the lift was working, it was a failure of process to get the passenger close to it so they could easily get to the passenger desk." The reason I read that is because this being a failure of a process as opposed to an intention to discriminate in any way suggests to me that maybe not. But I am not a lawyer and certainly it would be for others to determine whether a discrimination act had taken place or not.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I have questions from Deputy Doublet, then the Connétable of Lawrence, then the Connétable of St. Saviour, then a final supplementary from Deputy Tadier.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Did you see Deputy Wilson's ... I am not suggesting you should ask her but I think we are within the time possibly.

The Deputy Bailiff:

All right, Deputy Wilson as well.

1.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

When the Minister was commissioning the supplier of ferries, was the topic of accessibility covered and is this something that the Minister understands this supplier has considered from the outset because oftentimes people with disabilities are thought of at the last minute rather than built into processes?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is my understanding that under the customer care elements of tender processes - I believe in both cases - there were elements about accessibility. I believe that was the case and certainly, or at least we certainly were looking at their customer care processes ... policies is the word I am looking for. So both firms that were in that tender process obviously had their own procedures, and in the case of DFDS, their high rankings for customer care and I believe accessibility in the past were reassuring, is my understanding. But this is an incident. This, as I have just read out, does not seem to be the case that there is any intention to discriminate, as Deputy Tadier has suggested. It is a sad kind of human reality that processes do sometimes go wrong and that incidents sometimes do take place. It does not excuse the action, but it does say that what needs to happen is to learn. I believe the fact that DFDS themselves have directly reached out to the vessel flag state, which in this case is the United Kingdom as opposed to the Bahamas for other ferry companies, and also reached out to our own Disability and Inclusion Team shows that they take this extremely seriously. I do not believe that they think accessibility is the last of the priorities. That does not seem to be the case.

1.1.3 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet:

I understand that it was human error and not intentional, but I believe that we can learn from this collectively. Would the Minister agree that actually this should not ever happen again because if there was an emergency on that boat that individual could not have been evacuated? What I would like to see happen is for the Minister to talk to the Chief Minister so that across all departments, when any services are being commissioned, that there is some kind of step right at the beginning where accessibility is raised so that Ministers can establish whether there are processes and indeed processes to recover if those initial processes do not go right. I would like to see that embedded right from the beginning.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I believe such a conversation should probably involve the Minister for Treasury and Resources purely because procurement happens through Treasury. So I think that is where that - I am somewhat guessing here - but I think that may be the appropriate place because the commissioning, et cetera, does often happen through Treasury and the commercial services function. I think the reaction from DFDS in terms of particularly going to the vessel flag state and, like I said, our own Government Disability and Inclusion Team suggests to me that they are very much wishing to learn from this and make sure that this does not happen again, which is the right attitude. Because it is correct that mistakes do happen, but what is important is that you learn from them. It seems to me that they have that intention at heart. I think the Deputy's comments about accessibility and procurement processes were entirely valid, so I would be happy to have those conversations. I do not want the Minister for Treasury and Resources to feel on the spot. It was my guessing whether it was the Minister for Treasury and Resources as opposed to the Chief Minister, but whichever, all 3 of us.

[9:45]

1.1.4 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

I have got no idea how the person concerned must have felt being left in their vehicle, and I do wonder whether they were traveling alone or whether they had someone with them who could have stayed with them. My question though to the Minister is: how was the Minister made aware of this incident? Is there a process by which the department is made aware of such instances. I will follow up.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I thank the Constable for her question. I think it is really important, and this comes from DFDS directly, is that a staff member stayed with the passenger throughout the entire journey. They were not on their own during that journey. That is what they have informed me of. From the evacuation perspective, my assumption - it is only an assumption - is that that that would have enabled evacuation, et cetera. One of the reasons, because the passenger was offered a voyage on the Stena Vinga, but because of the passenger's own need to keep to a schedule that was not viable so the passenger opted to go on the Levante Jet. But, as it says here, the chief officer allowed the passenger to travel but remain in the vehicle with a member of crew staying with them for the entire journey or entire crossing, as I have here. I personally was not made aware of it except by officers and the media. I think it is one of the things in Jersey is that I am not - and I am not speaking about this incident - convinced that every operational incident should come to a Minister. I think operational incidents are meant to be dealt with by the companies themselves and the appropriate institutions around that, in this case, the vessel flag state. I think that is utterly appropriate that they have engaged with Government. One of my concerns for Jersey as a whole is that by raising everything to a Ministerial level it is not appropriate. I personally cannot sail ferries. I cannot mend lifts. I cannot change processes in a company. I think it is really important that we do in Jersey perhaps need to understand that operational matters do need to stay within any area with those companies or institutions that are providing the operations.

The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

I have to just apologise to the Minister because when he actually said how he had been made aware of this somebody coughed and I did not actually hear what his answer was to that.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It was via the media and officers.

The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

Via the media and ...?

The Deputy Bailiff:

And officers.

1.1.5 The Connétable of St. Lawrence:

And officers. I suppose my supplementary has to be quite understandable, the Minister himself need not be made aware of operational matters that arise but my question is does the process with DFDS require them to inform his officers then of such incidents? Is that what happened in this case?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I cannot be 100 per cent sure but I think my officers contacted DFDS. I do not think, and I have to say whether it is airlines, whether it is a ferry company, I am not convinced that such operational matters necessarily need to be reported to Government. I think when there is a more general ... if there is something going wrong at the port, as a general thing, or something at the airport, then I can understand why that would be raised to Government. But I think there is an element in Jersey, we

have to understand that Government is doing the work of Government. If this was systemic, that would clearly be a Ministerial and Government matter where a Minister needs to go in and say: “Look, you have got a systemic problem with accessibility issues, you need to sort it out”, and certainly with regard to the malfunctioning lift or non-functioning lift ... excuse me, may I just ask Members to not chatter around as I am trying to answer a question?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, Members should not converse noisily if they are distracting the speaker.

Deputy K.F. Morel:

It is a difficult line, but I am concerned in general in Jersey that we try to raise everything to a governmental level and I do not think when there are instances, which I hope are isolated, and if this was to prove in any way to not be isolated ... there is the fact that at the beginning of service the wheelchair lift was not in operation. That was a matter where a Minister needed to know because that was systemic. This appears now the lift is working; this is nothing to do with the lift not working. This is the company’s own processes and it appears to be an isolated matter. If it appeared not to be an isolated matter, I would absolutely expect that to come up to Government. But as an incident that is isolated, then I think it can rest with the company and the institutions that I have mentioned.

1.1.6 Connétable K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

After the Spirit of Free Enterprise disaster many years ago, I was under the impression it was a legal requirement that all vehicles in the vehicle bays on board ship, on the vehicle decks, must be vacated during transit, is that not the case?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I must profess my ignorance of the rules on that.

1.1.7 Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement:

It appears the Minister’s comments about if this was an isolated incident you could understand why that would need to be dealt with operationally but this is not an isolated incident. In actual fact there was an earlier incident earlier this year where there was a similar situation involving a person with a disability who could not access the provision on the boat, and that was due to the fact that the lift access was still a problem. I think my question to the Minister is what assurance is he seeking from DFDS on the learning that has taken place from these incidents that have clearly come to the public’s attention? But I would imagine that there is a general concern for anybody travelling with a disability about some of the adaptations and provisions that need to be addressed. Can he give some assurance to the Assembly that he will, as part of the contract monitoring arrangements, ensure that this is routinely monitored? I referred to a statement made by the Chief Minister earlier also, where he said that the operating agreement sets performance standards relating to customer satisfaction. I think what we would like to be assured about is how often they are monitored, how these are brought to the attention of the operator, and what changes happen as a result of these incidents taking place?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I can understand why the Deputy suggests that this is not isolated. The reason I say it is, is only because I understand the reasons to be different. The Deputy is referring to an incident that occurred when there were no lift provision on the Levante Jet. That was something that happened as they brought the vessel into service and, as Government, we weighed in and said you need to sort this out, this has to change very quickly, and they worked to change that by the end of July. The lift was brought in to service by the end of July. The reasons for this incident appear to be very different to that original incident and it is because of the difference in circumstances that I am saying that it does not appear to be systemic. There are 2 different causes for this. But I can understand why the Deputy is concerned there are. I think with regard to the monitoring, yes, I am more than happy to ask

officers to ask in their quarterly meetings that they speak about accessibility and the provision of facilities for people who have accessibility needs, and to ensure that these matters are learned from. As I said in response to Deputy Doublet's question, I am pleased to see that DFDS have not hidden from this in terms of their own reporting themselves to the vessel flag state and their own contacting the Government's Disability and Inclusion Unit. That suggests to me strongly that they wish to learn from this, and that is the appropriate attitude. As I said, it does not excuse the mistakes that led to these incidents but it absolutely does suggest they have the right attitude in learning.

1.1.8 Deputy M. Tadier:

First of all, can I clarify, contrary to what the Minister said, I did not suggest that there was intention to discriminate here, but what I said is that there may have been an act of discrimination under 7A of the law, which talks about indirect discrimination, failure to make reasonable adjustments regarding disability. One of the questions I would like the Minister to ask was would it have not been more reasonable for DFDS to have paused the departure to move things around, to open the lift up, so that this individual did not have to spend the four-plus hours sitting in his van? I am almost lost for words. The real question here also is: is the Minister not concerned that there has been a breach of law, so not simply a failure of process but, as the Connétable of St. Saviour has indicated, it seems that there is a *prima facie* breach of international maritime law by keeping somebody on the car deck? I know that when I travel with my dog, we are told that we are not allowed to go down except at specific times to see the dog in the vehicle, so they are very strict about that normally. But also a breach of Jersey's anti-discrimination law. Given the fact that it is all of our jobs to uphold the law, and not least for the Minister, if he thinks that there have been breaches, would he indicate whether there is any mechanism within his department, certainly when it comes to maritime law, to have this particular incident investigated properly?

Deputy K.F. Morel:

I only demurred on the issue of law because I am not a lawyer and I am not *au fait* with all these laws. If there has been a breach of law then I believe it would be called to the harbourmaster to look into that. I am happy to speak to the harbourmaster to look into that. I think this is one of those interesting cases where if - and only if - the Deputy is correct and misinterpretation of the law with regard to staying on the car deck, that that was the solution which enabled the passenger to travel to their destination in the time that the passenger needed to travel to their destination. I do not know what the situation would have been with the case of unloading the vessel but my guess is that this passenger would then have also missed the ... they were travelling onwards and so they needed to get to their point of departure for travel at a certain time. So it may be the case that if there was a breach of the law it was with the intention to help this traveller get to where they needed to at the time they needed to. Something of a Catch-22 in that respect following the mistakes that they had made in their processes. But I will speak to the harbourmaster and ask him to look into that from a legal perspective.

PUBLIC BUSINESS - resumption

2. Draft Residential Tenancy (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- (P.24/2025) - resumption

The Deputy Bailiff:

We now return to the Residential Tenancy Amendment Law and we had reached the appel in Second Reading and Deputy Gorst had requested that there be a separate vote on Articles 7A to 7G inclusive, which the Minister agreed to, and the Connétable of St Lawrence asked for a copy of the law showing the amendments, which has now been supplied. But we do need now to move to the appel, do we not, Minister? Is that your understanding? How do you propose to take matters? Do you want all the amendments taken together apart from 7A to 7G?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

That is right, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. This will be all amendments with the exception of the provisions introducing Articles 7A to 7G inclusive, and to remind Members 7A to 7G is the title restrictions on rent increases and providing rent information. We will vote first on the Articles in Second Reading with the exception of 7A to 7G inclusive. I invite the Greffier to open the voting.

[10:00]

If all Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. Those amendments have been adopted:

POUR: 31		CONTRE: 13		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of Trinity		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy C.F. Labey		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy K.F. Morel		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy I.J. Gorst		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy R.E. Binet		
Deputy S.G. Luce		Deputy A. Howell		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Deputy B. Ward		
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				

Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

I will move on to the ...

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

Could I just ask a question? Given the point that was raised yesterday by the Constable of St Lawrence and I understand we do have the documents. Could we have just a little bit more information about the content of the Articles as we are voting on them? I believe that would help to guide Members through this.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Well, you have now voted on them all, apart from 7A to 7G inclusive. Maybe, Minister, it is appropriate for you to indicate what 7A to 7E inclusive deal with.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

These are all the provisions to do with rent itself. That includes the stabilisation mechanisms and the gathering of rent data. As I said when this was raised yesterday, not having this Article would cause substantial issues with the operation of the law.

The Deputy Bailiff:

We are now voting on 7A to 7G inclusive, which can be found at pages 53 and 54 of the Ministerial proposition and, of course, can be found in the document you received yesterday afternoon from the Greffier. I invite the Greffier to please open the voting in relation to these Articles. All Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that those Articles have also been adopted:

POUR: 24		CONTRE: 20		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of Trinity		
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of St. Clement		
Connétable of St. Peter		Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Martin		Connétable of St. Ouen		
Connétable of St. John		Connétable of St. Saviour		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy C.F. Labey		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy K.F. Morel		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat		Deputy I. Gardiner		
Deputy R.J. Ward		Deputy I.J. Gorst		
Deputy C.S. Alves		Deputy H.M. Miles		
Deputy L.J. Farnham		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Deputy S.Y. Mézec		Deputy R.E. Binet		
Deputy T.A. Coles		Deputy M.E. Millar		
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée		Deputy A. Howell		
Deputy D.J. Warr		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		

Deputy J. Renouf		Deputy M.R. Ferey		
Deputy C.D. Curtis		Deputy B. Ward		
Deputy L.V. Feltham		Deputy K.M. Wilson		
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

The Deputy Bailiff:

Minister, do you propose the matter in Third Reading?

2.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Yes. I thank Members for their support so far on this. We have had in total over 2 days' worth of debates on this, lots of debates on amendments, and I am absolutely confident that what we have before us now, as approved at the Article stage, is stronger than where we started. I hope that myself and contributions from Scrutiny - and, in fact, Deputy Renouf as well - have been able to provide Members with perhaps some reassurance that they were hoping for, moving in for this debate. I thank all those Members who have had all kinds of dialogue in the run-up to this to help provide that. I hope, having had the opportunity to go through the consolidated version of this overnight, Members can see that this is a good piece of work that seeks to do all that it set out to do, which was to provide a better and more modern framework for renting, both for people who rent those homes and for people who rent out those homes as well. I completely respect every Member who might want to maintain a principled opposition to this all the way through, but I hope that Members will recognise that some of the points that were made in opposition to it at various points have been dealt with by the amendments and by rebuttals that have been presented in this, so I hope that in Third Reading Members will continue to support it.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded? **[Seconded]**

2.1.1 Connétable D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence:

I would like to thank the Greffe on behalf of Members **[Approbation]** for producing this document for us. Notwithstanding that I sat through the debate over the past 2 days and understood the amendments at the time, without this, I think that I would not have known this morning exactly what I was voting for. But, thanks to the Greffe and the officers, I knew exactly what I was voting for this morning and, clearly, the law has my support. I thank the Minister for the work that he has done on this. **[Approbation]**

2.1.2 Deputy B. Ward of St. Clement:

I will not repeat the whole of my previous speech, as this is now a matter of record, but I do rise to emphasise my real concern regarding the economical aspects, which in my view have been put to one side and not been taken as seriously as they should regarding the changes that are being introduced. I am unsure who agreed to the release of the economic impact assessment to all States Members; however, I express my thanks for whoever authorised that release. This important paper was actually sent after the vote was taken on Tuesday when the principles were presented by the Minister. I must ask why States Members were only furnished with this information after the proposition was presented and voted on. I understand that Scrutiny - and I will stand corrected if I have misheard - was provided with this paper. Surely, Members should have been provided with the

paper at the same time, and if not, why not? It is my view that States Members should be furnished with any relevant facts to ensure that when voting on propositions we can make an informed decision. From my research, as set out in my speech, I expressed concerns regarding the economical position going forward, expressing that we need to be cautious and take no risks, as we just do not know what is around the corner. In my view, I feel the changes in the Draft Tenancy Law at this time may be a risk to our economy. Therefore, I will not be supporting a Third Reading.

2.1.3 Deputy A. Howell of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

I rise to thank the Minister, his officers, the Scrutiny Panel and the Scrutiny officers who have put in such an incredible amount of work to bring this proposition before the Assembly, and to the Members of the States Greffe and officials who have helped - in their words - "the most difficult piece of legislation they have ever had to deal with" run smoothly. My position is this: I support good landlords and good tenants. I do not support greedy and bad landlords or bad tenants. That said, I need to express my concerns about the proposals. Thanks to the work of the Scrutiny Panel and Deputy Renouf's agreed amendment for removal of the 5 per cent cap, proposals are improved. But I still feel that the proposals may have a deleterious effect on the number of private dwellings available for rent, as I have spoken with many good landlords who have said they will not want to be landlords in future if this legislation goes ahead. I have had one landlord in tears in my surgery. Unfortunately, these proposals are bringing fear and worry. The common strategic plan says the Government will deliver, I quote: "A new residential tenancy law to improve arrangements for both tenants and landlords." I do not believe what is proposed will improve arrangements for both landlords and tenants. It has been reported that it may be beneficial for some tenants but not all, and it will not be beneficial - in my opinion - for landlords. Currently, a landlord and a tenant sign a straightforward agreement that can be renewed on an agreed fixed term. I am unsure now what agreement can be signed if this legislation is passed. Will every landlord and every tenant need to refer continually to the hundreds of pages of legislation? We have been warned that there are likely to be unintended consequences to Jersey's economy too because the Residential Tenancy Law does not evidence the scale of the problems it is correcting. It is not possible to assess whether, on balance, these amendments offer a net benefit to Jersey's economy. It is not based on evidence. Indeed, the law may have a negative impact on Jersey's economy as a result of landlords exiting the market. This will lead to fewer properties being offered to rent, resulting in an increase in the average rental prices for those remaining, due to market forces and less choice. Worse, regrettably, is the possibility of more Islanders with no home at all. We rely on the private rental accommodation for homes for half of the population. I want stability in rented housing for this Island. I want things that are simple and easy to understand. I urge Members to vote against these proposals.

2.1.4 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

A Member reminded us that our responsibility is to make good law. Conviction alone does not make good law. Unfortunately, neither does the hard work of officers and Scrutiny if they are working in the dark and the policy intent remains unclear. To make good law, we must first be clear what it is meant to deliver. In other words, what are we trying to do and what will the law do? Only then can we ask: "Will it work, and at what cost?" That is the question addressed by the late-stage economic impact assessment. Politicians, like investors, are not professional gamblers. The risks they take should be educated ones. Nor should the hard work of the Government economists who prepared the economic impact assessment be sidelined. They are not political advisers.; they seek to be apolitical. Their struggle is that the policy intent here is unclear. At the beginning of the speech, the Minister described this law as: "A better and more modern framework to help tenants and landlords." He also has said: "This law supports victims of revenge evictions and unaffordable rents"; I presume. The economic impact assessment asks: will it really? What is the actual evidence for revenge evictions and extortionate rents? How widespread is the problem, and in what circumstances do they occur? What would be the political and economic trade-off for the community as a whole if this law is

supported? Our Common Strategic Policy had a different focus: to build confidence in the rental sector as part of the Future Jersey outcome of affordable living under the theme of economic well-being. Affordable living strengthens the economy. A broad, stable rental market sustains it. Yet, the assessment and contributions during this debate warn that this law, if approved, risks undermining both. Think ahead to the Budget debate to be held later this year; we will be scrambling to fund priorities from whatever funds we can find. Do we also want to deter investment in the provision of private rental properties when there already are easier and more profitable ways for private people with funds or properties to earn money from capital from those properties? It is a mistake to assume landlord divestment benefits affordable housing.

[10:15]

Homes sold may not go to lower income buyers; they may be bought by wealthier owner-occupiers, converted into luxury residences or lucrative Airbnbs, or even left vacant. The effects on prices may be marginal but the rental market shrinks, leaving tenants who cannot buy with fewer options and higher rents. If rent controls are drawn too tightly, landlords may repackage homes as private lodgings for 5 or fewer people, removing security of tenure and escaping regulation of the quasi-rents that they get. That strips protections for individuals and makes renting more precarious. The Minister's focus has generated much paperwork, but what is its value if the rights it creates are not enforced? A tribunal can intimidate tenants as much as a court, because you cannot force a camel to drink. This draft law provides no route to more supportive landlords or more social housing; measures that would make a real difference to victims of bad practice who, believe it or not, I wish to help too. Instead, it risks driving away supportive landlords. Restricting leases or forcing landlords to justify decisions will not stop dishonesty but will reduce confidence in renting and supply. The assessment calculates £300,000 in new costs for landlords, and many of these are not professional landlords. It will be easier and cheaper for such landlords to create lightly regulated lodgings than to offer secure tenancies. These are foreseeable consequences. One unforeseen consequence was mentioned to me by a tenant in St. Helier who is now leaving the Island; that is that landlords will take fewer risks in taking on tenants. In the U.K., many letting agencies are using a tenant-screening internet platform that demands high deposits for what it deems, under its algorithms, to be riskier tenants. It does not recognise Jersey passports, which almost means the deposits go up. Do we want to make things easier or harder for tenants? Meanwhile, the Minister's current powers to extend notice periods for periodic tenancies remain untested, let alone enforced. Practical support for tenants, social housing, advisory and mediation services - expanded, improved - may help more than another layer of regulation. We should also remember the real drivers of unaffordable living: stagnant wages and rising inflation. These cannot be regulated away by targeting landlords. Over-regulation risks costing our workforce homes and people and deepening our economic problems, which are pretty significant. As for our economic problems, we must stop treating the symptoms rather than administering the cure and putting out fires with gasoline. We can learn from past mistakes. When the Assembly rushed to raise the apprentice minimum wage, the unintended effects were found to be damaging and the policy had to be abandoned, reversed, partly reversed - whatever you want to call it. That retreat was reasonably quick; not quick enough for some who did not benefit from apprentice schemes. Retreating from this law, if implemented, will not be so fast and the effects can be much longer lasting. The Minister's conviction has not been matched by inter-Ministerial collaboration. He resisted compromise, even with Scrutiny, through much of this process of debate and delayed accepting amendments from Scrutiny until the last moment. Now he has run out of road. He cannot change that economic impact assessment and what it has pointed out. Rejecting this draft law should not be seen as a failure, but as a chance to start again on fresher ground, with more open eyes. If the true aim is to support tenants, the Minister might look to these policy goals of expanding advice services, supporting courts in assessing rents, strengthening mediation, using existing powers to link notice to tenancy length, and providing clearer routes and more support into social housing. These measures, at least in my opinion, would deliver affordable living and economic well-being

together, not at the expense of each other. I urge Members to reject this draft law and thank them all for looking into the arguments and for thinking much more about this issue. If they do so, it is not an ending; it should be a beginning. Let us, in that way, support the Minister in building a simpler, collaborative solution that offers practical supports to tenants, sustains landlord confidence, and strengthens the rental market upon which so many of our workers rely.

2.1.5 Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin:

As everyone who knows me knows, I see lots of parishioners every week; many are landlords and some are tenants and, to my surprise, not one person has come in to see me about the RTL (Residential Tenancy Law). As an aside, Statistics Jersey have reported that St. Martin is the most intelligent Parish in the Island [**Laughter**], which I thought I would just like to get in there; so, people in St. Martin do know what they are talking about. But it is absolutely true; I have not had the scaremongering that lots of other people seem to have had. I have read it through; I have read it thoroughly; I will be voting for this. But before I sit down, I would like to say that this has been a really good, robust and technical debate and it has gone on for a long time. I really want to praise the Scrutiny Panel and the officers of the Greffe and the Minister and his team in Government. If anyone asks in future why we have Scrutiny, I think we should all point to this debate, because I think Scrutiny with the debate has been gold standard, so thank you. [**Approbation**]

2.1.6 Connétable M. Labey of Grouville:

I am sure the Minister already knows my opinions about this; we have spoken about it many times. I, too, like previous speakers, believe this provides us with a great deal of uncertainty in the marketplace. Marketplaces rely on an element of certainty so they can thrive and I believe this is doing just the opposite. I also believe - and like the Minister, I have very little statistical proof for this, but it is my belief - that a lot of landlords have already made the decision to sell. The marketplace that they are trying to sell within is not going support that sale at all because it is in the doldrums. We have many single-bedroom flats that are unsold in the marketplace and that is suppressing it. Interest rates are also suppressing it and there are other factors. I believe they have already made that decision and they are waiting for the market to improve before they sell. My daughter, as we have already said in July, has already done so and she did so at the right time. They are facing a great deal of uncertainty. A lot of their costs have gone up. Their insurance certainly has; my own has gone up by 27 per cent. Building materials are going up way beyond the cost of inflation. The ability to get contractors on to site if you are a single unit owner is very difficult indeed, and their costs have gone up. Everything is going up, and to be told they cannot put their rents up within this framework, I believe, is providing that uncertainty. That uncertainty is what is going to force them out of the market and I cannot support this because, like other speakers, I believe they are already in the process of going through sales to get rid of these properties which are no longer assets; they are becoming a liability. I cannot support this.

2.1.7 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

It is probably not good to speak out of frustration or anger, so I will try not to do that, but the last speaker ... I wonder sometimes, where is the self-awareness in this Assembly? We have a representative for a rural district standing up saying: "My daughter, who used to be a landlord, just sold her property and she did all right out of it, and [presumably] now she has only got one property that she lives in." Well, welcome to the real world, Constable, because most people in Jersey are not landlords; they do not own vast amounts of property. If they are lucky, they might be paying off a mortgage in the home that they live in, along with a partner, and struggling to do that every month. Probably that is the reason we see people not going out in the evenings, because they have not got any money to buy the ice creams that they might in France or to go to the restaurants. That is the reality that we are living with in Jersey. To say that some landlords may have to sell some of their properties because they are worried is simply scaremongering and I am not sure what we are supposed

to do with that. The overwhelming message I have had talking to people ... when I go to the shops after work and they say: "Oh, I hear you were in for a long debate today; you were debating the Residential Tenancy. Should not half of the people in there not be allowed to vote, because aren't they all landlords?" Those are the real messages we have been getting throughout the debate, from the outside. Because we have been living in a bubble here. When we hear Members talking about the potential unintended consequences and the negative consequences this might have for the economy, I will tell you what is negative potentially for the economy: not having young people in the Island because they see no future for themselves here because they cannot afford the rents, let alone the house prices. I know Members will try to argue in some sophisticated way that, actually, this is going to have a knock-on effect on the housing market and prices, but what we are seeing is some glimmers of hope. The mortgage people and also the estate agents that I have been talking to say ... one of them who lives in St. Brelade I met on a recent walk and I said: "How are things going in the industry?" He says: "Things are starting to pick up. If you look at the transactions that have been through the courts in the last 12 months, they are up from what they were last year, the interest rates are coming down, and we are starting to see some movement in the market." I have full confidence in the market, actually, that if landlords sell properties, they will be bought. They will either be bought, as I have said before, by people looking to continue to be landlords who want to consolidate ... because there will be some bargains to be had here for rich landlords. They can come in and swoop up. Is it called in a bear market? I do not know; is that the right expression? When the prices are going down, you buy up and you consolidate your assets and you provide more rental accommodation for those landlords who are getting slightly weak on it. When I turn to the Deputy for the district that I live in and she says that members of the public - landlords - have been coming to her in tears. Well, I think that is largely because they have been [Aside] ... that is right, she is my Deputy; she is one of my Deputies. When the landlords come to her saying that they are in tears, I am afraid that is because of the disinformation and the misinformation that has been spread around by this debate. Because, as the moderate Members in this Assembly who have sat through all of the amendments have heard, actually, this is really modest. It does not force landlords to do anything. It does not even force them to abide by R.P.I. (retail price index) increases. They can put prices up above R.P.I. They can put prices up by 50 per cent if they want to, but it has to be reasonable, it has to be agreed by the tenant, there has to be consent. The underlying principle that it is still a private arrangement between tenant and landlord holds true. In all circumstances where both parties are acting reasonably ... accepting that there are going to be imperfections and imbalances of power on both sides because, of course, the landlord holds the keys maybe - in one sense, they hold the property - but the tenant has to act responsibly in it. Of course, we know that that is why the underlying purpose of the law is to ensure, only in extreme circumstances where there is an abuse on either side, that the law can kick in. But otherwise, the mutual relationship - as Deputy Bailhache has forcefully argued - has not fundamentally changed. It has fundamentally remained the same: that tenants and landlords will be allowed to negotiate privately and peacefully as they should. I would ask that, as we are on the brink of passing something quite momentous but also quite modest in a sense ... these are laws which Tory Governments in other countries would have put through a long time ago because they are really the basics. I will not quote them verbatim, and I do not often like to quote the *Jersey Evening Post*, but I think their editorial today really summed it up: it is about getting that balance right between tenants on the one side who expect some security of tenure to be left in peace to pay their rent on time, and landlords to expect that they will get their income on time, they will act reasonably.

[10:30]

It should not be rocket science. What we have seen through this dialectical process, which has been referred to Scrutiny ... it could have been called in at the Second Reading; it was not. I think Scrutiny have done their work in good faith and there have been some real material changes where the Minister has put aside some of maybe what would be ideological concerns and looked at it pragmatically and

said: “How do we get to a middle point that protects both landlords and tenants?” which has got the backing of Scrutiny and which, I think, should have the backing of the majority in this Assembly. I do congratulate, of course, not just the Minister but the Scrutiny Panel and all those who have been involved in this. I reiterate, I come at this from, I hope, a middle point of view where I have got friends and family who are landlords, but I also know lots of people in Jersey who are tenants. I think the vast majority who are neither tenants nor landlords look at us to try and put something reasonable in place, and they will be saying ... I think for the first time, not an easy task, but Deputy Mézec has hopefully, with the team around him in the wider Assembly, been able to put something workable together. We need that to have time to bed in and to make sure that it works. Of course, if problems do arise in the future that have not been envisaged one way or the other, then those can be addressed through the legislative process, and that will be for future Scrutiny Panels and for the future Assembly to keep a vigilant eye on.

2.1.8 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I am going to support the Minister on this. I think it is reasonable and, with the efforts of the Scrutiny Panel, we have got to something that is a good balance. Clearly, there were problems there; I want to refer again to the number of submissions that the Scrutiny Panel received. Clearly, there were problems there and the Minister has tackled that. I will be voting to support it, but I have listened also to the risks that were mentioned. I think Deputy Scott raised them again in her speech. We have spoken about the impact on the tenants and the impacts on landlords, and I think we all have those risks in mind. I would like to ask the Minister how the impact of this legislation on these groups of people is going to be measured going forward. If we pass this legislation today, how will we understand that it is doing what the Minister intends it to do, and what the Assembly intends it to do? Are there going to be set review points that the Minister would recommend to either himself, if he is reappointed, or to his predecessor? What would that look like? What do the measures themselves look like? What does success look like? What might the potential risks be and how will the Minister mitigate those? There is another group of Islanders which I do not believe we have really spoken about, although Deputy Tadier did just touch on them. Sometimes we describe this group as “middle Jersey”. It is often Islanders who are neither tenants nor landlords, so maybe we have not thought about them a great deal in this debate. Islanders who maybe own one home and live in it; I count myself in that group as well. Middle Jersey, not just in the context of housing, but my panel has had lots of questions for the Minister for Social Security, and I know that this is something that she is bearing in mind. But other Ministers, I would really like them to think about this group as well, and the Minister for Housing in particular. Because while I have been thinking this through and talking it through with other Members, I am not sure what impact this is going to have on that group of Islanders - middle Jersey - who own one home and live it, sometimes at great struggle. Again, Deputy Tadier mentioned Islanders who may be in this situation who cannot afford to go out and buy an ice cream or go for a meal. That is the reality for many Islanders who are, yes, privileged to a certain extent to own their own home but make great sacrifices and often are not entitled to Government support in the form of income support or other means of supporting. What happens if landlords do sell properties now in numbers and the housing market is flooded even further and prices drop even further? What happens then? What will the Government do? I have advocated in the past for help-to-buy schemes which are often targeted at first-time buyers, but what about those Islanders who have made huge sacrifices to buy that one modest home to live in? How is this legislation going to impact that group of Islanders? What about people who are in a modest one-bedroom flat - we know that is the type of housing that the prices are dropping most drastically - and maybe they find themselves in negative equity and they want to start a family? What do they do? What help to buy will they get if they feel negative impacts in that respect? Now, I will reiterate: I am going to support this legislation and I do think Members should support it, but I want us to take very seriously the measuring and monitoring of any negative impacts on different areas of our population. I will refer briefly to a review that my panel is currently undertaking, a sub-panel, because we are hearing that

people are putting off having children or not having children altogether or terminating pregnancies that are wanted because they cannot afford adequate housing for a family. This situation is really serious. I can see from the Minister's expression that he does take this seriously, and I will be interested to hear how he is going to monitor this and plan to mitigate it. I will be listening with interest to the Minister's summing up.

2.1.9 Deputy H.L. Jeune of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

At the beginning of this debate, I challenged Members to be bold and not shy away from complex reform, but be prepared to shape, test and improve it together because Islanders deserved a full and open debate that took us from the principles to the details that govern their homes, rights and responsibilities. I think we stepped up to the challenge. We did not dismiss these amendments to the law out of hand, but we have worked together to discuss the different elements that we felt needed further adjustments and we have voted accordingly. Now it is up for us individually to decide if these draft amendments to the 2011 law, with the enhanced amendments that we have voted on over the last few days, is something to support. For me, it is. I want to emphasise that, as a landlord in Jersey, I support the changes that are made now to the amendments. I also am a landlord in Belgium with much harder and much, much stronger legislation that landlords have to abide by there, and it is all right. We manage. We manage. I wanted to take that moment to say that I do not think landlords should be worried about these changes that are here; they are modest. As Deputy Tadier said, in many other countries, more conservative governments pass this kind of legislation. It is something to adjust to, but it is not something that is catastrophic for the ability to be a landlord. I wanted to focus on some of the changes that we have done in the last few days, because I do hear that Members - and those maybe listening as well - may not quite understand where we have got to with the law now than where it was before. On rent stabilisation, there has been an amended version of rent stabilisation measures because there has been a strong call for greater transparency and predictability in rent setting. There has been evidence for this; Scrutiny has heard this evidence. There have been reports done in the past - not necessarily by the current Government, but in the past as well - that there needs to be greater transparency and predictability in rent setting. The panel and expert adviser found that limiting rent increases to once a year with 2 months' notice and, in many instances, limited R.P.I. ... uncontroversial and were aligned with best practice. As I have said before, during a public hearing, the Jersey Estate Agents' Association confirmed that enshrining them in the Amendment Law would merely formalise an existing convention. After the adopted amendment, this is what the rent stabilisation measures would be; and I think that they are proportionate. On the Rent Tribunal, the creation of a rent tribunal is positive as a dispute resolution mechanism, though there are still questions remaining about resourcing operations and reliance on secondary legislation to create the rent tribunal. To address this, the panel recommends that the Minister publish practical decision-making guidance in consultation with the Judicial Greffier and prioritise reliable rent data collection. As we have heard over the last few days, this data collection is widely welcome and desperately needed. The adoption of amendments A2 and A3 by Scrutiny means that the tribunal member qualifications are set by regulation, not Ministerial Order, and that, most importantly, the tribunal stays as a reactive and passive body. Together, these amendments safeguard the tribunal's expertise while ensuring that its role remains proportionate to its remit. Many tenants expressed to Scrutiny - the evidence that we collected - were concerned that under the 2011 law, it has been too easy for landlords to serve notice to end a tenancy. This has made tenants reluctant to raise real issues, for fear of fixed terms ending silently through non-renewals or being served 3-month notice without reason during periodic terms. The move to default periodic tenancies is welcomed by tenant-focused organisations, but there are still concerns remaining about its practical impact and that is why we have - and it maybe talks to Deputy Doublet's point - recommended to the Minister a post-implementation review within 2 years and the publication of clear guidance for both tenants and landlords. I believe the Minister has accepted this. As amended, the Articles now allow for an initial fixed term of up to 3 years, with a chance to end that contract early with no reason, giving a 3-month

notice for landlords and a one-month notice for tenants, provided that clearly specified break clauses requirements are included in that agreement. The panel considers that the Minister's adopted amendment to have break clauses clearly stated in the initial fixed-term contract will improve transparency and ensure that both landlords and tenants understand their rights and obligations from the outset. As we have noted in our report, there is no clear evidence that a shift to periodic tenancies in and of itself will provide more security than rolling fixed-term contracts. But what the Minister is putting forward in his policy objectives is that where it provides more security is when these contracts are linked to a specific notice regime, where notice periods can range from 7 days to one year. With the amendment by the Scrutiny Panel being able to give no-reason one-year notice, this provides the extra security that landlords were calling for, if one of the reasons for notice does not fall into what they need. Article 6F provides a wide-ranging list of grounds for notice. As the Minister has confirmed, in order to serve notice, it only requires the landlord to reference which grounds under Article 6F they are using. There is no requirement to provide any evidence up front. It would be up to the tenant to initiate court proceedings to challenge a false or misleading notice, placing responsibility for correcting landlords' non-compliance on the tenant. The panel was concerned about the objective tests of what constitutes, for example, a serious breach of tenancy; we have asked the Minister to provide clear guidance on what this could be. As agreed with the Minister on enforcement and nuisance grounds, the requirement for a police or States employee to attend a nuisance was considered impractical and risked misdirecting public resources. The panel welcomes the adoption of amendment C1, which removed this requirement and ensures that public resources are directed appropriately while still enabling landlords to make immediate action in genuine cases of serious or repeated nuisance. The panel have also recommended the Minister publish example-based guidance to clarify what constitutes a serious breach or nuisance, to ensure that the provisions of the law are interpreted correctly. The Assembly also adopted the panel's amendment D1 to move the level 3 criminal penalty for a landlord giving false or misleading grounds for notice into secondary legislation. This will provide greater flexibility and enable future refinement through proper Scrutiny, ensuring that penalties remain proportionate. As agreed, Scrutiny will be working with the Minister to develop this further. We also recommended cohesive development of civil and criminal penalties in consultation with the Viscount to ensure consistency and enforceability across the penalties framework. Members will appreciate that the Amendment Law is very complex and difficult to navigate. As such, the panel have made a number of recommendations aimed to improve Islanders' knowledge. We have recommended updating the model tenancy agreement, designating the Housing Advice Service as the primary contact point, and ensuring it is fully resourced to support tenants and landlords. The transition from the 2011 law to the new regime will be staggered, with existing fixed-term leases running their course, but periodic agreements falling under the new law at commencement of the law.

[10:45]

I hope that I have given maybe a little bit more fullness to understanding by Members and those listening of what changes we have made in the last few days to try to make this law, as we have heard from Members, proportionate and supportive of both tenants and landlords. I want to conclude by thanking colleagues for the constructive debate for supporting the panel's amendments. This has been a challenging and technical piece of legislation, but by working together we have significantly, I believe, strengthened it. The changes agreed during this debate will make the law fairer, clearer, and more workable in practice, and they reflect the concerns of tenants, landlords and stakeholders alike. I commend the Assembly for its careful consideration of these issues and I trust that the law as amended will provide a more balanced framework that serves the Island well in the years ahead.

[Approbation]

The Deputy Bailiff:

Do you have a point of clarification?

Deputy B. Ward:

Yes.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Will you accept a point of clarification from Deputy Ward?

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes.

Deputy B. Ward:

I wanted to wait until the Deputy finished her speech, out of respect.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes, of course.

Deputy B. Ward:

You said that existing tenancies would run their course. Could the Deputy direct us as to where it says that in the draft law that we received last evening? I could not find that, so I would be most grateful if you could spell that out. It is a very important aspect.

Deputy H.L. Jeune:

Yes, under schedule 3 it provides that transitional arrangement. Also, within the Scrutiny Panel's document we have a clear chapter on transitional arrangements. I believe the Minister also, when in introducing the law within the first part, he had a report that also clearly stated the transitional arrangements. It would mean that any fixed-term lease would run its course and then a new fixed-term lease would be able to be issued under the law, so that would mean that the contract could be up to 3 years in fixed-term after the fixed term has finished.

Deputy B. Ward:

Carrying on with that clarification, I tried to look for that and I see that the 9-year lease has been removed. If somebody is on a 9-year lease as of today, that runs. It is just not clear in the actual law, if somebody reads that. We need that assurance.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Perhaps the Minister in reply will deal with schedule 3 and assist you in relation to that.

2.1.10 Connétable R.D. Johnson of St. Mary:

I am pleased to follow my Scrutiny chair on this and, given the detail she has provided, I assure Members I shall not be going through it again. I would like to make a few general points. The first is that, at the outset of this debate, I expressed my recognition that views on this general reform or whatever were polarised. We all received emails from one side or the other: "Please vote for...", "Please vote against..." without any reference to what we were scrutinising and the nuances contained within the law. I like to think that with the aid of the Scrutiny Report and the contributions made by Members and the response from the Minister for Housing, we have arrived at a situation where there is some more general consensus and the public as a whole do recognise that this is a comprehensive and co-ordinated response to the situation. In that connection, I revert to a comment made by Deputy Renouf in one of his earlier speeches that this is actually a proposition made by the Assembly rather than just the Minister. I thank the Minister for accepting our recommendations. In the course of this debate, I have given greater priority to the public's views as a whole, as proper of a Scrutiny Member, but I have also had regard to my own situation. As I mentioned at the outset, I myself am a landlord, having converted outbuildings on our premises. It is natural that I should look at the new law, if passed, to see what changes it makes to my present position. The answer is virtually none.

Personally, I follow best practice. I would never dream of increasing rent by more than R.P.I., never more than once a year, and I believe that is the established practice for most landlords. I therefore do revert to the Minister's position that this should not change very much. Most landlords have nothing to fear by this new legislation, and I do ask those thinking of exiting the market why they feel the need to do so. That said, I am obliged to utter one word of caution. Reading yesterday's *Times* in the evening, there is a headline - a U.K. headline, obviously - "Landlords sell up ahead of Renters' Rights Bill." There are certain parallels within our proposed law with the Renters' Rights Bill, and I can see why analogy is made to the Jersey situation; however, the Renters' Rights Bill is more fundamental. It introduces standards that I think we already have, and compliance with those standards will be enough to frighten some U.K. landlords out of the situation. There is also the related point that it is not just the Renters' Rights Bill which might be frightening landlords, but the threat of the introduction of national insurance. I raise that point in particular to say that, while I support this proposition in its entirety, we must be careful and recognise that landlords are a vulnerable breed at the moment. They feel that they have had a whole succession of legislation imposed on them. Some may well think in terms of exiting the market, and I do urge Ministers to think twice before introducing any further regulations which might affect them. That said, I support the proposition.

2.1.11 Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John:

As has already been said, the issue has been well debated and the proposals have been thoroughly scrutinised. Many people contributed to that Scrutiny process and much of the feedback has been accepted. I would like to add my thanks to both the Scrutiny Panel and the Minister. In my personal experience, the Minister has been collaborative and we now find ourselves with an improved system. I should also pay tribute to the Jersey Landlords Association; those members I have spoken to have been reasonable people, have listened, and have contributed to this debate and discussion. If we cast our minds back to July, Deputy Wilson asked a very important oral question in that sitting. The Deputy asked: "What measures, if any, are being introduced in the coming months to reverse the continuing trend of more people leaving Jersey than moving to the Island, particularly in relation to the 20 to 29 year-olds?" By supporting the proposals, we all have an opportunity to show Islanders, particularly our young Islanders, that we are taking these issues seriously. Some of us received correspondence from Caritas that told us that the changes being suggested are actually supported by many landlords who see them as very sensible and not onerous in any way. Many have voiced to them that they are helpful to landlords as well as tenants. I shared my concerns - my personal concerns - and those concerns expressed to me by landlords with the Minister, particularly around the 5 per cent and the notice period. The Minister listened to me and others with the same concerns. Both of these have, in my view, been addressed. I also spoke to landlords during the period who clearly had not read the proposals but had relied on what they were being told. Earlier this week, myself and my colleague in front of me from St. Ouen spoke to a landlord. Their view was that the changes were acceptable with the amendments and contained, in their words, "some good stuff". It is fair to say that the individual was and is not a fan of the Minister. That said, they are a very reasonable person and they can see the merits in front of us. As I said in July, in supporting this, Members will give hope to existing Island families: parents and grandparents who are keen for their family to return; parents and grandparents who do not want to see their children leave. Members will also give hope to those who work in health, education and other sectors who are fed up of seeing people come and go as if it were a revolving door. Only this week, I was talking to someone whose landlord lives in Australia; they will not fix a problem with their house and they are threatening to leave the Island because of this small matter. We have got to get further advanced. Finally, I hope Members will do the same as I do on each and every proposal, and that is vote for the proposals based on their content, the benefit for the whole community, and not based on who brings the proposal.

2.1.12 Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North:

Actually, I put my light on for Deputy Tadier's speech, which I got to jump, but it was good to hear several speakers in between, so I may have calmed down now. But for speech, is it a possibility to ask for clarifications from the Attorney General on specific Articles during this one?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

It is about schedule 3. I am grateful to the chair of the Scrutiny Panel, and to the Minister also, for engaging with me, because it was good engagement. I just would like to clarify, schedule 3(2)(c) ... why I am asking this question, as Deputy Barbara Ward asked, is what is important now is to understand the transitions, and to have this clarity for the public as well as for ourselves. From my understanding from engagement between myself and the Minister and the chair of the Scrutiny Panel, the moment that a currently existing, fixed-term contract finishes, a landlord can sign a new fixed-term contract. I would like an interpretation from the Attorney General just to confirm if it is correct and if schedule 3(2)(c) does require to give any notifications, and if you do not give notification, you cannot sign new fixed-term contract. It can be answered later; whatever is more appropriate for the Attorney General.

Mr. M.H. Temple K.C., H.M Attorney General:

Could I have a moment to think about that, Sir?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Yes.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Absolutely, yes. Okay, I can continue with ... first of all, as mentioned by other speakers, the Minister for Housing has done lots of work with Scrutiny. I know it is not easy, and I know that it was different views, and the Minister for Housing did work with Scrutiny and with the Assembly to bring as much as possible from everyone's perspective to moderate the initial proposal. I am grateful to the Minister for Housing and to the Scrutiny Panel for this. A couple of questions that I asked the Minister for Housing. First of all, what are his views about the negative equity that is currently facing Islanders who bought property over the last 3 years? I did not receive this answer to my first; I would like to hear this at the end of this debate. Because as I stated in my speech, I do worry about Jersey's economy. I do worry that prices continue to fall. I do worry that people who purchase - what we call "middle Jersey" as Deputy Doublet mentioned - are facing negative equity, will not be able to sell, will not be able to downsize or upsize. It is a really serious question for me. I am, at the same time, content and I feel it is really important to wait for what the Minister agreed to Scrutiny as suggested - to have post-legislative Scrutiny. Actually, as Deputy Tadier said at the end of his speech, if something does not work, we might need to change. Another thing; I think it is on page 6. Enaction of these amendments is by Ministerial Order; so, as an Assembly - not in this term and not in the next term - we will debate when it will come into force, when it will start to apply. I would like if the Minister can indicate in his closing speech what is his timescale to enact all amendments, parts of the amendments, what will be enacted and when. At least an approximate schedule so that the public would understand what it means in practice. Because we do need to enact.

[11:00]

I do respect the process and I think we have gone through a really good process - not an easy one - and the Assembly got to the decision and we are in the Third Reading. I did vote against Article 7 because I believe there are areas like economy where we do not need to interrupt. But this is, like I said, an ideological belief like Deputy Tadier's ideological belief in taking from the rich to give to the poor. I do not believe that ... I am really worried this intervention on rent control, whatever we

call it, stabilisation - it is a rent control - will have a negative effect of our economy, but we are how we are and I am going to support, and I really wish that we can start to speak in a less offensive language towards the landlords. They are contributing to our economy. Most of them are not greedy landlords and when Members are making political points, we can make political points without offensive language that does not help our Jersey community. It is very difficult and most of the landlords are good landlords. Most of the landlords are not professional landlords. They are contributing and they are good with their tenants. The offensive language during this debate in the Assembly towards members of our community who are contributing to the economy, who are contributing to tax and who have allowed people who are less fortunate to receive their benefits and support, do not need to be called names in this Assembly. It is an important point that I would like to make because once we are finished in this debate, we will have more debates, and I know that we are all getting very emotional. Let us try to be as respectful as possible towards each other and towards the members of the public that are there. I am looking for the summing up where probably this law will be adopted, and we did do a very good job with Scrutiny and with Deputy Renouf's amendment. I think we are in a different place from where we started. If the Attorney General would have an answer, it would be helpful.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Attorney, are you ready to respond to the question that Deputy Gardiner has asked?

The Attorney General:

Yes. The Deputy was asking a question in relation to existing tenancies, as I understand it, for a specified because her question was in relation to paragraph 2(2)(c) of schedule 3 and that paragraph falls under the heading "Existing Tenancies for a Specified Term". So that is a situation where the landlord and tenant have agreed that a tenancy will last, say, 2 years. It is a fixed term of 2 years. So I think it is important to read (c) of paragraph 2(2) in the context of all of the provisions in paragraphs 2 and 3 of schedule 3 because schedule 3 does, in my view, provide a comprehensive transitional regime for dealing with specific tenancies and indeed for periodic tenancies, which I will not deal with, but the schedule does cover periodic tenancies as well. So if we look at paragraph 2 of schedule 3, there is a clear statement in paragraph 2(1): "An existing tenancy for a specified term remains subject to this law as it was immediately before the 2025 amendments came into force." So that tenancy continues even after this new amending law comes into force, so that is the starting point, but there are more detailed provisions in paragraph 2 which vary that starting point. So paragraph 2(2)(a): "But the residential tenancy agreement for the existing term cannot be varied or renewed despite its provisions (instead the parties may enter into a new agreement under this law as amended that starts after the existing tenancy ends)." So what the parties cannot do is to try and amend an existing specified term to get around other provisions in the Residential Tenancy Law but what paragraph 2(2)(a) does allow them to do is to create a new agreement so they can enter into a new initial term which is covered by other provisions earlier in the law. So they can enter into a new initial term, which the law allows up to a period of 3 years in the operative provisions earlier in the law so they can do that in paragraph 2(2)(b). But if there is a requirement to give notice for the tenancy to end, then that has to be done in accordance with paragraph 3 of schedule 3, which details how notice is given. What the Deputy was specifically concerned with was subparagraph (c) of paragraph 2 so if, after the 2025 amendments came into force, the specified term ends and the tenant continues to occupy the residential unit on the basis of a recurrent period, the existing tenancy becomes a periodic tenancy. So if there is a recurrent period, then that becomes a periodic tenancy and that will be subject to the provisions concerning periodic tenancies in the law including the provisions on notice periods. So if a tenant has been in occupation, say, for more than 5 years, then the requirement will be to give notice for 6 months, or with the amendment that the Minister has accepted, I believe a requirement to give notice for 12 months being 12 months' notice for no reason. So that is what that subparagraph (c) that the Deputy has asked me about is concerned with. I

appreciate it is a long answer but I think it is important that I answer the Deputy's question in relation to all the relevant paragraphs which bear on this issue.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

If I can just clarify and simplify that, if the new contract has been signed and not just, say, tenants continue to leave after the initial contract that is currently in place has finished, so then if the new contract is signed, it does not matter. I mean it does.

The Attorney General:

So if a new contract is signed, that becomes subject to an initial term arrangement under the law for up to 3 years.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Thank you, Attorney. Does anyone wish to speak on the matter in Third Reading

2.1.13 Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade:

I will start by reassuring Members that I have calmed down since my speech last night. **[Laughter]** Over the last couple of days as I cycled along the front to come here, the waves were coming over the wall and there were sheets of spray drenching the cycle path. I was forced to change my route at several points to ensure I got here safely and I think that is perhaps a small reflection of where we are at here. The Minister has had to change course. He has avoided being drenched on a few occasions by accepting amendments, and I congratulate the Minister and Scrutiny for their constructive engagement to get us this far. But I want to address the reasons why I think we should maintain our support for this legislation, I said in my opening speech we need to respond to those people, especially the less well-off, whose lived experience is that the system is stacked against them. They look to Government for some protection. We need to show that our politics can deliver some tangible improvements to their lives otherwise we will be fuelling the anger, frustration and nihilism that lead people towards political extremes. I want to turn briefly to something that was not debated when we debated the principles but was introduced when the amendments were considered, which is the economic impact analysis. Incidentally, my understanding is that the report was commissioned by Deputy Scott and, therefore, the Minister had no control over whether or when it was released. It has been trumpeted by some as a lethal blow to these reforms because it identifies high costs to the economy but it is nothing of the sort. It is a reasonable piece of work in its own terms but it is also a thin piece of work because the analysis is exceptionally narrow. It repeats some standard economic nostrums, but without exploring wider issues in a wider context, and of course there is a different law before us now than the one that was the subject of the economic impact analysis. There is, for example, no word on methodology so we do not know why some things were considered in the reports and others not but I would just draw attention to a couple of specific points. It does not consider the null hypothesis; the costs to the economy of doing nothing. It does not consider how changes in the U.K. might affect the rental market in Jersey. As the U.K. adopts much stronger protection for tenants, what effect will a weekly regulated Jersey rental market have on our ability to recruit essential workers? I have to say the calculation about the supposed costs of these reforms has the "back of a fag packet" feel to it. It places a cost on checking contracts to ensure they are compliant with the new legislation but it does not appear to have calculated the marginal cost because contracts of course are always checked before being reissued. In calculating returns for a landlord, it relies only on rental income when there is not a single property owner I know who does not factor in capital gain as part of their overall return when holding property. Equally, we all know, as property owners, that property is a cyclical business with good years and bad years. A snapshot taken at one point in time is not indicative of the decision-making that most property owners make. I think the truth is

that a little reading of the economic impact analysis is you would never be able to change the Residential Tenancy Law because there are always going to be some costs. We do not do economic impact analysis, for example, when the minimum wage was introduced and we do not do them for budgets. That is because it is well understood that policies of this nature have some costs, but also some benefits, and it is exceptionally hard to quantify both sides of the equation. So the balance between the 2 is essentially political so we have ended up with a more modest set of amendments to the Residential Tenancy Law than originally proposed. The result is that the changes to the R.T.L. are now much more balanced. If your starting point is that the current law is perfectly balanced, then you will not accept that conclusion, but I do not think that the previous law had magically arrived at the perfect balance in relations between landlord and tenant. This new version advances some significant protection for tenants while rowing back on the measures that have attracted the greatest opposition from landlords. The rough edges have been taken off, if you like. We have to thank Scrutiny for that and also the Minister who perhaps set aside some of the passionate rhetoric of the early summer and engaged in a constructive way with Scrutiny and with the Assembly. Let me, if I may, finish with this observation. What we have ended up with is a set of amendments that do not give anyone everything they want but does allow all sides to claim a victory. Some might say that means we have a fudge, but for this politician at least, the compromises feel more like success than failure.

[11:15]

Therefore, for me, passing this proposition as amended would be a victory for our democratic process. It would show that we can deliver meaningful change while being respectful of all sides in the argument. It is not perfect but, then again, nothing is. It is progress. I am a landlord and I very much hope that we pass this legislation.

2.1.14 Deputy K.F. Morel:

Listening to previous speakers, a few things do come to mind, and one of them is genuinely I agree that it is good to see the Assembly working as it should. I think one of my fears over the last 3 years is a sense of people not understanding what Scrutiny is and the value of Scrutiny. I am pleased to see that that is changing, and I thank the panel for their work on this as a result. I also do want to congratulate Deputy Mézec. I think it is really nice to see anyone - and this is just because I like to see people I know being happy - who works hard at something reach for a compromise in order to get what they wish, which is just by a firm belief in politics. Anyone who stands there and says: "This is the only way" is almost certainly wrong and, unfortunately, in the critique of Deputy Mézec, he too often does say: "This is the only way" and, therefore, I think he is often wrong. But in this case, the Deputy has reached out for the views of others and, as a result, has reached a compromise which, in this case, I do not believe he is fudge but he is better as a result. But Deputy Mézec has worked hard. There is no doubt about it and, as a result, Deputy Mézec has got something that he wished to see, and I do congratulate a fellow Minister for that and well done in that respect. I have held my counsel throughout this debate until now. I have said nothing on it except the odd amendment here and there but, on the main law, I absolutely have not but I do still have concerns. There are no doubts, and this is because I do think about Jersey as an investment proposition. "Why would people want to invest in Jersey?" is the thing that goes through my head constantly. So my concerns in this perspective are particularly around property rights. Jersey has always been a place where property rights are very clearly understood and simply understood and, as a result, that has created a reason for people to wish to invest in Jersey. I am still concerned that this law blurs some property rights and could therefore have a detrimental effect on either people who are already in Jersey seeking to invest more in the Island or people outside the Island who look to invest and, obviously, inwards investment is something the Island will always need. I am pleased that we knocked the rough edges off the rent rises, as Deputy Renouf said, and if I remember rightly, that was due to Deputy Renouf's amendment and I think that is better, but I do still have issues with rent

capping. Over my 7 years in the States Assembly, I have really come to the view that in Jersey, over the last 30 years, 40 years or however long, the Government has entered too far into our lives. What that means is that the Government decides things for us and I just think that government, as an organisation, is limited in its capacities and so is not capable of deciding things for us all the time. Especially as we have only a 20 per cent tax rate in itself that leads to a small government in terms of the capabilities of that government which are clearly restricted. So I am concerned particularly around things like some of the periodic tenancies and the rent capping and that the Government is moving too far into our lives deciding things for citizens, and I do not think Governments should be doing that. We will not know until the future passes and becomes the past whether this will have any economic impact. That is the truth of it. The economic advisers who provided that assessment, I have no doubt, did it to the best of their ability in a very short period of time with, as the assessment says, very little evidence to work with but I have no doubt they gave it their best. But no matter what they say, we will not know until time passes and we see the impacts of the law and, if things go well, very little will change. If things do not go well, I think we could see, as some people have said, landlords may well sell. That could be a boon for people wishing to get on the property ladder as that would likely cause property prices to fall. But the flip side of that is if that landlord is selling for people to owner/occupy, you will have fewer rental properties, and that could see rents rising significantly as a result regardless of any rent capping in here. The market will prevail, I can always promise, in that respect. So where, on one side prices fall, it will be a seesaw, and the other side will go up, and the reason I say that is because there are 2 things and only 2 things that will bring both property prices and rents down in this Island. Only 2 things and that is basically increasing the amount of housing on this Island through increasing the supply on this Island no matter Residential Tenancy Laws and no matter how many help to buy schemes. All you are doing, as far as pricing is concerned, is playing with the edges. There are 2 things that will bring the price down. We build more units of accommodation on this Island or we build a fixed link to the continent where people are able to live off the Island and come in. They are the only 2 things that will do that. We have the choice over the years which way we want to go but it is true that the only way you can bring prices down on both sides of that seesaw are ultimately linked to supply and demand. You either remove demand by helping people live elsewhere and work here or you increase supply. That is the only thing that is going to happen and no amount of legislation will change that. That brings me slightly to another point because I do feel sometimes that politicians always feel that laws will make a difference, and we do not solve the world's ills through laws, I can promise you. Policies and strategies and working together, which is exactly what the Minister has done here, will do that. The other thing I am not keen on is I do worry about government officers being seen more and more as regulators as police in themselves. This is linked to the Government coming into our lives too much. I really do worry about that. I think it puts them in a really difficult position and if people want to understand why, one of the reasons people do not like Government is because Government becomes the police of our own lives outside of the criminal which, obviously, does need to be policed. I have no issue with that but we create these pockets of regulation in government where government officers suddenly can tell you what to do. Again, I grew up in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s when communism was in full flow and where Governments were using those things actively against their populations. Now I do not expect that ever to happen here in Jersey in a malicious way but what happens is that, as Government has more and more policing roles, people will hate Government more and more. It is a really simple fact and I think these are things that we should be aware of. As far as this is concerned, this is a more modest draft that is correct. There are still some fundamental problems in my mind with it about the rights of individuals on this Island and how this butts up against them, so I am likely to maintain my non-support for this, but I will continue to listen to Members. But despite my non-support, I can still see a good piece of work in terms of the effort and the passion with which Deputy Mézec has worked on this, and I really do congratulate him for that effort and that passion.

2.1.15 Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier Central:

I rise to speak briefly because after 2½ days, I think we have just about run out of everything we could possibly say, but I feel quite joyful even about the process that I have just witnessed which is the effective use of Scrutiny and the listening of a Minister to what Scrutiny has said, which has effectively worked as it should do. Now when I first started doing Scrutiny some while back nearly 20 years, what used to standardly happen was that we would produce a report full of 20 or 14 recommendations as to how we might proceed, and then Ministers would regularly put a cold blanket on it and forget it and try and bury it. That is what used to happen regularly. Scrutiny was ineffective. I have seen Scrutiny being highly effective in arriving at the conclusion that it has come to, which has involved the Minister taking some compromise saying: “I cannot have everything I want but at least I can bring this and this will be an improvement.” That Minister has been congratulated absolutely for listening and co-operating with the Scrutiny process and Scrutiny has my praise for doing exactly what it should, which is to go in quite minute detail about how the system might operate, so congratulations to all around. It is rare for me to do that but I think it is deserved.

2.1.16 Deputy D.J. Warr of St. Helier South:

This is not about whether the legislation is right or wrong. I voted positively for all the amendments. This is a timing issue. This is a perception issue. I fully respect the huge effort we have on Scrutiny and the Minister for Housing’s team has put in to updating this law. I remind Members that, no matter how they vote, the 2011 law remains in place with all its protections. I recognise it is not perfect but this is ultimately about the wider risk to our economy. The negative equity points raised by Deputy Gardiner and Deputy Doublet are very valid. I make no apology for repeating a part of my speech from a couple of days ago as I am hugely concerned about the uncertainty and lack of an impact assessment that the legislation may have on our economy. We seem to be getting into the habit in this Assembly of putting the economy on the backburner as if it were a nice thing to have. I despair when Ministers have to have their arms twisted when it comes to issues such as apprenticeship pay because they simply do not understand how the economy functions, how markets function, and have no idea that markets need certainty. The following was posted on LinkedIn a couple of days ago and I quote: “Just a quick count of sales and currently out of about 40 sales instructions, some 16 properties are previously tenanted properties which the landlord or vendor has decided to sell. None of these properties is a bad state. They are all kept in a good state and let for a long time sometimes for long-term tenants. The vendors have decided to sell. Generally the leases come to a natural end. Most are fed up with being vilified by a Government which has done so much damage.” These are the realities when uncertainty creeps into the market. This is happening in real time. The market is not waiting for feedback. It is not going to wait for a couple of years for data. It is reacting to the evidence in front of it. This is a real impact now on people’s lives. Deputy Bailhache described approving this legislation as playing with fire. That is what we are doing here, playing fast and loose with our economy, simply because there seems to be a complete antipathy towards collecting relevant data. I simply remind Members of the following. If landlords decide to remove properties from the rental market and either use them as holiday lets or leave them vacant, this would lead to a reduction in the supply of properties to rent which, in turn, will lead to less choice for tenants and could lead to rents being increased by more than they otherwise would have. For example, rents not covered in the rent stabilisation measures.

[11:30]

Some landlords may be deterred from investing in additional buy-to-let properties and some potential landlords may be deterred from entering the buy-to-let market. This will reduce demand in the housing market which, in the short-term, could affect the viability of new developments and this affects both the supply of rental properties and also the supply of homes for private purchase. Neither outcome is desirable. Fewer newer developments or slower rate at which developments take place could affect the supply of new homes for Islanders, which in turn will have an effect on Jersey’s economy. There are likely to be unintended consequences to Jersey’s economy too. Because the

Residential Tenancy Law does not evidence the problem or the scale of the problems it is correcting. It is not possible to assess whether on balance these amendments offer a net benefit to Jersey's economy. I refuse to endorse any legislation that could put our economy in jeopardy, creates uncertainty in the minds of investors. Yes, we are talking about people's homes but we need individuals and businesses who will invest in property to provide homes. They too need certainty. I fully respect the attempt to tighten up the existing legislation. However, there is a timing issue here, our economy is in a fragile place. How does bringing legislation that has been described as a sledgehammer to crack a nut help anyone at this time?

2.1.17 Deputy T.J.A. Binet of St. Saviour:

I had not intended to say anything but I think, as a fellow Minister who has voted against this proposition, I owe the Assembly and the general public a very short explanation as to where I stand. I have made a few notes as to what I was going to say but I think I can sum it up by saying I think Deputy Morel summarised virtually everything I had to say. Strangely enough, there were a number of comments made by Deputy Southern that I think were quite laudable and very much support what Deputy Warr has had to say. I think we would do well to listen to that. Rather than harp on about anything, I think I am going to make a serious point. Whether it is just perception or otherwise I think this is going to cause a dent to this particular sector. I think that while we want to do what we are doing here, we also have to be proactive. I am risking my neck here, and apologies to the Chief Minister and the Minister for Treasury and Resources, but I am going to say that the removal of the 3 per cent surcharge on second properties, it is high time that was removed. I hope that throughout the budgetary process this Assembly finds a way of doing that because it will send a message to the sector that we are not completely deaf and that we are prepared to take some measures that help the market to pick up again. Because, as Deputy Morel said, supply in this instance really is the answer. The more properties there are the more choice a tenant has. I have discussed this proposition a couple of times with the Minister and I think we have very similar objectives, slightly different methods perhaps. But I hope that that plea does not go unnoticed as we go through to the Budget.

2.1.18 Deputy S.G. Luce of Grouville and St. Martin:

I am inclined to speak, particularly following the Constable of St. Mary. He and I have sat on Scrutiny Panels before and when he talks of work in Scrutiny I sit up and take notice. I was very pleased to hear his speech and it made me think. I do not necessarily agree with all his outcomes but I too am one who is grateful for the work that Scrutiny have done on this review, and he was part of that work. The Constable of St. John, his next door neighbour, spoke of the content and how important it is that we look at the content of what we have in front of us now. But for me, intent rather than content is more important here. The policy intent was sold to us as something which is going to be better for landlords and for tenants. But I fear that eventually we will see that the intent here has always been to help tenants more than landlords. It is true to say there are things in here for both sides. But to use an extreme analogy, there is nothing we can put in place to help landlords when they turn up at a property they own after a few weeks or months of non-rent payment, to find that the door is open, the property is empty and the tenant has disappeared away from the Island. But getting back to the content, I am afraid that I see more red tape, I see more rules, and that may well be the intent of the Minister and it is an inevitable end game for work that we are doing here. Many have spoken about the possibility of landlords leaving the market and selling. Some have spoken about the state of the market at the moment when it comes to selling and the difficulties of selling at the price the vendors would wish to receive. I know first-hand that some people have decided not to sell but they have told me yesterday that they intend to go to a management company and have their property rented out through that company causing them more cost, more hassle and getting away from the informal and friendly relationship they have with their tenant. They worry about the future but they know that if they have their property rented through a management company, all the rules will be complied with. But at the same time they will, say, apply an R.P.I. increase on an annual

basis, something which they do not currently do. In that case, where is the benefit for either landlord or tenant? The tenant will get more of an increase than they might have done otherwise, the landlord gets more work to do and more payments to make. Nevertheless, I will just make a couple of more comments about R.P.I. I am not in favour of Government intervening in marketplaces and I never have been. But rent is one cost that tenants face, others might be electricity, water, insurance. How would those people feel if we instructed the electricity company or the water company that they could not increase their prices by more than R.P.I.? In the face of huge investment in both cases, electricity and water, that would cause them serious problems. As I have said, I am against the principle of rent control. I really feel that this law, as good as it is in some places, is introducing something which I just cannot agree with, and that is the principle of Government intervening with the amount of rent that can be charged. For that reason I cannot agree to support this.

2.1.19 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

I am trying to bring a little bit more positivity to the day; we were so positive. I would like to start off by saying again about Scrutiny because I think it is important. We point out the really important role that Scrutiny has taken on there. I was pleased to hear, and let me remind people because I think that the previous speaker seemed to question the intentions of the Minister, when what the Minister has clearly demonstrated and indeed it has been said in this Assembly by Members from across the Assembly that he has been willing to compromise and do a proper job with Scrutiny and Scrutiny have done a proper job with the Minister, which is exactly what we aspire to across the Assembly. We have had a very long debate. We have talked about all of the Articles, they have been agreed when they were in Third Reading. It is clear that ideologically some Members of this Assembly simply will not vote for this; they were not ever going to from the beginning and then they are, therefore, not taking into account what the actual law says and the reality of it. I would like to thank the Constable of St. Lawrence because yesterday - I have to be honest now, I am a very honest man - when the Constable said: "Can we have a printout of this?" I thought, no, no, but when I went away it did help; it helped a lot and I thank her for that. Because I looked at it last night and I thought I understand all of it but it is like a stalk thing that the sum is more than the total of the parts, you have to understand when things go together, so it gave me some clarity. It also gave me some reassurance and I would like to just mention a few things for that and the reasons why I would support this, and I would urge other Members to support it. This is a step towards fairness. It is a step towards transparency and it is a step towards stability because everybody knows where they are. That is a really important part for any market, stability. We seem to be forgetting that; above the sound of ideologies clashing we might get to some reality in where we are. Housing is not a luxury, it is a necessity and we are a very advanced modern Island with that standard of housing. I do not think there is anyone in this Assembly would want to be so negative about Jersey to say that they are in acceptable housing. I think we are talking Jersey down a little bit here at times with where we are but let us try and be positive. Some of the transformative changes that are in here about the rent increases linked to R.P.I., which was accepted as an amendment, I have to remind Members and I remind the Constable of Grouville but there are exemptions for specific criteria: significant improvement to homes, and if rents have fallen below market rates; that is a built-in protection for landlords. That is a tangible, real built-in protection for landlords. Regards the Rent Tribunal, I think a rent tribunal is long overdue. I think the previous Minister talked about rent tribunals, they never happened. We are now at the point of applying and doing and it is that point of doing that is so important in politics and as an Assembly. They do allow disputes to be resolved fairly. I will not quote it for you, the part of the law that says about setting up the Rent Tribunal is very important, because it asks for the right people to be there, legally qualified people who know about housing, they have experience in that. The decisions will be made based around the law and they will be detached from buyers, which is really important for tenant and landlord; there is clarity there. I think that is a really big step forward. There are Members here who at one time would support tribunals elsewhere, employment tribunals, for example, but when we come to a rent tribunal - it might be due

to the ideologies again that sounded those ideologies getting in the way of where we are - it seems we cannot support a rent tribunal. I think it is a positive thing. There are clear termination rules. In terms of arbitrary, let us call them arbitrary evictions, okay, and the idea is we do not know how many. By definition we will not know how many. By definition we will not. I have said before, if people are saying we do not want any controls over that, you have to ask yourself: how many of those will you allow? How many for you is okay? How many individuals or families being given an arbitrary eviction from somewhere and having to have their lives disrupted is okay for you? For me it is not okay. I cannot look people in the eyes and say: "I think that is okay for you to go through that." I think we need something much more positive than that and this law does that; it stops that happening. For that reason it is not anti-landlord, that rhetoric that has been talked about. I have not heard the lambasting of landlords here. I have said repeatedly these are the things that will support landlords in this law. The Scrutiny Panel have brought those things, they have consulted on that. There was wide consultation on that. I do not recognise that in this, and that is why we have got to a position where I think across the Assembly we have got so much agreement and so much positive. I want to try and address some of the economic issues here, supposed economic issues. When tenants feel secure they spend more confidently in the local community. They can plan their incomes, they know what their costs are going to be. They can say: "No, I can go out once a month to eat." They can put money into the local economy; that is a really important point. A point of economy seen as the economic issues seem to be a bit more about feel than actual real information because they are not there. They will do that and that is a really important thing to do and, in turn, supports local businesses, and that is where we want their money spent, in local businesses.

[11:45]

The Rent Tribunal, which uses litigation costs, saving time and money for landlords, tenants and the courts. The courts are incredibly expensive and not accessible to a lot of people, therefore, that will not be necessary. The Rent Tribunal will solve those problems; that saves money. We talked about data but this is the first time we have got a data-driven requirement for landlords to record data on rents, which enables better policy-making way into the future. We have accurate market insights, target housing support more effectively and plan our future developments more wisely. There is a product of this which is way beyond that, which is a positive for our economy, very positive looking forward. We seem to be forgetting that. Also, this encourages responsible investment. By setting fair rules we attract responsible investors who value long-term returns over short-term exploitation or gain. This helps professionalise the rental sector and improves housing quality. That is a stable, effective, modern market. For the free marketeers who say we should not have any regulation, surely that is what they want, a market that is based upon a good firm basis that regulates itself. We can have arguments about that which would be quite nice over a cup of tea but for this that is where we will end up. We are talking about protecting tenants, which in the end I think addresses productivity. When workers have secure housing they are more productive, less stressed and more likely to stay in Jersey supporting our workforce and our economy. Those soft links - and I do not think they are that soft, to be quite frank - to the economy are really important, that firm basis that you can build a career in Jersey with. That is where we will go, talked about his family, I am in a position my daughter is leaving Jersey, partly because of the expense of living here and she wants to see other things and she is coming home to live for a while and will save thousands of pounds when she comes home because we will not charge her to live there and then she will have some money to start herself elsewhere, away from Jersey. She has done everything right, gone to university, studied, come back, works here, pays her taxes. We have to address this and these are not draconian in any way. These are about building a really sensible approach to our housing, which I think will help in the future. The idea of responsible landlords, I think the vast majority of landlords are responsible. They recognise it is a home that is being rented out and, therefore, there is a relationship of responsibility. These amendments promote stability for them, not restriction. Ethical lands we value, steady returns with a fairer, more transparent system. They will not have to compete with unscrupulous landlords who

do whatever they fancy at the time and give them a bad name; it is as simple as that. From the people that I talked to, I think we can all come up with anecdotal stories about a few people that we speak to but we do not have massive insights across, but anyway we will move on. This reform I would suggest filters out what we might call exploitative practice, not genuine housing providers. I think it was mentioned before, that people have said that that is not what they are seeing from people who are coming to talk to them. If landlords do exit because they do not want to take that positive approach, then it opens the market for a renewal. A market renewal is not a threat, it is a sign of progress. We might get some renewals in the market with the standards that we want and make things better for our young people when they live here. Stable rents, better tenants, reduced turnover, lower maintenance costs benefit landlords in the long run. These things work together to fit. Sorry, Sir, I know we have had a long day. But I really want to be clear that I think the economic arguments are scaremongering and I think we have heard them so many times from people. Let us get above those ideologies. Let us look at the fact that this is a decent piece of work that has been done by the Minister with Scrutiny and across this Assembly. I think it was somebody who said this: look at what is happening here, not the personalities involved, those who are bringing it. It has moved on from that. This has been really good work and a long time in the making and some incredible work by the officers that have been involved. This is not easy. I think we have a point there, we have had the debate, we have come through it and I really urge Members to support this in Third Reading. Let us move forward and we can come out with something very positive at the end of this sitting. I think the vast majority of this Island would be very, very pleased to see us doing. I completely support this and I will be supporting it in Third Reading.

2.1.20 Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade:

I would not wish to repeat any matters which others have extolled at length. But my points really are over the potential consequences of accepting this law. Many Jersey landlords are not sophisticated experts and I am worried that the proposed measures will have the effect of scaring them off into disposing of their property. Will they have to resort to management companies to take advice as to what they should or should not do? I suspect they will. Effectively, most small landlords wish to comply with the law. They do not want to have to circumvent any regulations which we may put before them. I think the problem is we do not quite know what the consequential effects may be. There is very little data. There is little data as regards, as has been mentioned, why properties have been disposed of. Have they been disposed of because they are rental properties or just through changed family circumstances? There are lots of reasons as to why people have a rental property. Have they inherited it? Have they saved up and bought it for themselves? Have they bought it as a buy-to-let proposition? We do not know this. To pick up a point that the Minister for Health and Social Services made a bit earlier, without the data applying to buy-to-let properties or the knowledge, should we be actually following the proposal set which may reduce the stamp duty on that? In simple terms, my apprehension regarding us passing the proposition remains. But I am very grateful for the work which is being done by the Scrutiny Panel and the Minister for conceding various elements, which serves to, potentially, soften the blow, if I can use those words, to the proposed law as such. I look forward to hearing the conclusion of the Minister in his summing up and hoping that he will assure me that increased interference by Government in our lives is a good thing, rather than the converse.

2.1.21 Deputy L.J. Farnham of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

This debate has been a lot about principles versus the detail, of course principles, our principles are important. Our political principles are important but also so is the detail, so is good law. I understand the challenges, the difficulties in juxtapositioning out some of our principles in the law cannot always lead to the right conclusions. I think we have to get back and think about what we are trying to do here. The housing landscape, the housing market, has been a blight of concern and worry for many years, probably decades. The affordability of homes, the security of homes, especially for the less

well-off in our society, has been a major factor. I remember the struggles I went through to afford to buy a home 30-odd years ago. It only got harder for youngsters now to do that. When are we going to wake up to this? When are we going to understand that, as I said before, if we do what we have always done we will get what we have always got? Here in front of us we have a real opportunity to make improvements. The Draft Residential Tenancy Amendment Law before us represents a measured and balanced and necessary step towards strengthening our legal framework for rented homes. If adopted, it will fill a clear commitment that this Assembly made to improve the arrangements for tenants and landlords and to help address the wider pressures within our housing system. I have not heard any arguments that it will not do that. The arguments have been largely about principles and there is no one with more of a principle, as my colleagues will know, in relation to free market economy and reduction in regulation. But there are areas that this Island, this Assembly of Government, have significantly over-regulated and there are areas that need, dare I say it, some more helpful regulations and legislation to ensure those markets are working properly for us. The need for action is plain. Jersey is experiencing challenges that if left unchecked threaten our social cohesion, our economic resilience and perhaps most important of all our demographic sustainability. We have heard a lot of criticism or claims that this is going to severely damage our economy; well it is not going to seriously damage our economy. Economics are basically best addressed when we look at longer-term solutions and the biggest threat ... and the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development is not here but he will recognise it, it is his piece of work. Our biggest risk to this Island, to our economic well-being, is working-age population, a falling birth rate. We know that many hundreds of young Islanders are leaving the Island to seek better lives elsewhere, better because they can find more affordable homes to bring up families than they can here. Let me just give some examples about how an affordable secure housing market is crucial to Jersey's economy. Attracting a workforce, affordable housing helps attract and retain diverse workforce, including essential workers, people working in our health and education services. Economic stability, when residents have access to affordable secure housing they are more likely to spend money in the local economy contributing towards economic growth and stability. Reducing inequality, providing affordable housing can help reduce social inequality. Ensuring that lower income families have access to stable living conditions which can lead to improved educational and health outcomes. Supporting local business, a stable population with secure housing supports local businesses, as residents are more likely to shop locally and engage in community activities. Investment in our infrastructure, a stable and affordable housing market will lead to improvement in local infrastructure, including transportation, schools and public services. That is all work that is part, the foundations are laid in the Common Strategic Plan that this Assembly agreed. Overall, secure and affordable housing, not just to buy but to rent, gives a foundational element that supports economic growth and well-being. We know there will be a one-off cost to landlords and possibly tenants and that has been estimated at something like 7,000 hours of admin costs, maybe changing agreements, which split among, I do not know, 13,000 or 14,000 tenancies in the private sector, whatever that figure is, is not a lot but there is a one-off cost. I maintain that the benefits of working towards creating a more secure and affordable housing market is far more beneficial to our economy, dealing with the longer-term economic strategy that is being presented, than a short-term impact, which is outweighed at the moment. The real and only impact we are seeing on our housing markets are due to interest rates and other geopolitical conditions leading to higher inflation; that is where the real challenges are coming from. We have already proven that by increasing the supply, which is starting to happen and that is gaining momentum, together with schemes to get people into their own homes, have been very popular. I want to join Members in thanking the Landlords Association and Scrutiny and all Members and Ministers for putting a lot of work into this, as other Members have said. It is an example of a collaboration and I join others in recommending the compromises that have been made from all quarters.

[12:00]

Importantly, following those discussions, what we have in front of us now lays the groundwork for a better understanding of our rental sector overall. For the first time, going back to the economic argument because the advice we have is inconclusive because there is no data to base it on, for the first time we will collect reliable data on actual rents charged, which will be absolutely vital in how we might improve this law even further into the future. As I mentioned, when we had the debate some time ago, half of all households in Jersey live in rented homes; roughly speaking it is 54 per cent, I think, home ownership. As in line with other jurisdictions, I think I would like to see that increase. I would like to see more young families go into home ownership but I would still like to see a very successful and viable private rental sector working alongside that. Sometimes if you see a rebalancing, sometimes you take some rental houses out, they are purchased, then you could see a healthier rental market on the back of that as housing stock itself rebalances. But as roughly half of our Islanders live in rented accommodation, it is fair to say that probably half of our children and young people live in rental accommodation. We must remember our duty to care in those sectors. It is important, Members will note from working with the Children's Commission, how important it is as part of the work we are doing with children and young people to provide stable homes but still too many children are growing up in homes where there is uncertainty about the future of the type of housing their family can afford into the future. The law we have before us today, if accepted, will create a pathway that will help children by giving the families the stability they need and the confidence to stay with us and plan for the future; it will bring predictability to rents. It will allow families to plan and invest in the future. It will give Islanders, especially young people, the confidence they need to believe they have a good future here. Good landlords have absolutely nothing to fear. Landlords in my family and friends, all of them have absolutely no problem with this at all. The vast majority of landlords will not see any differences because they are adhering to some of these rules and they go even further in some instances. It is the landlords that are not so good, the very few landlords that may seek to exploit or take advantage of tenants, that will be brought into line reasonably by this legislation. I think we have had a number of days of debate. I know that the vote is very close. I would ask this Assembly to remember its responsibility to Islanders. This is a sensible and balanced piece of legislation, despite some of the good debate we have had, some of the strong rhetoric we have had around some of the arguments. It is a strong and balanced piece of legislation that has been very well scrutinised. We have come to a compromise. I really do urge Members. I urge my colleagues, Ministers and Assistant Ministers and the Council of Ministers. It has been difficult for us as a Government because we are divided on it and we are falling back in this position to the democracy of this Assembly. I urge Members - I really do urge Members - to please help to boost the confidence, put confidence back in our housing market, build confidence for our young people and pass this legislation, so we can start on that journey.

2.1.22 Deputy I.J. Gorst of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

It has been an interesting Third Reading, Sir, and you have been extremely lenient in your interpretation of Standing Orders but we would expect nothing other than that from you, of course. I imagine one comment from a member of Reform Jersey has got the Minister a little bit concerned. Because I have always been ever so slightly confused since in the United Kingdom we have seen the emergence of a political party called Reform, which has got really no foundations in common with Reform Jersey. But we heard this morning that one member of Reform has absolute confidence in the market and he was starting to sound as though perhaps he was edging towards policy positions of Reform in the United Kingdom. No doubt the Minister will have to deal with that after this sitting. The reason I was surprised about that was because even I, who is a free marketeer, recognises that the free market only works within what I think of as a Judean Christian framework where there are safeguards appropriately in place. We find ourselves, as other Members have said, with a law in front of us which is quite different from the one that was initially presented and debated in the original debate and the principles back before the summer recess. I think I said in some of the commentary yesterday that we do find ourselves now with the accepted amendments, particularly when it comes

to rent control and tenancy agreements, with what can be described as best practice in the marketplace. I have done my best throughout this debate to seek to have rent control removed altogether from this legislation for all of the reasons I have articulated. It is slightly disappointing to me that some colleagues seek to pooh-pooh economic assessments and undermine economic assessments because this Assembly must take into account all of the evidence that is presented. To my mind, that economic assessment is an important part of the data that we have got in front of us. Because economic assessments are based on what the future implications might be. The future implications in regard to this legislation of course is driven by human actions and it is quite difficult to second-guess what human actions might be in light of any particular piece of legislation. Because this is what we have seen elsewhere, I do think that this legislation will lead to the more corporatisation of the rental market in Jersey. For some people they may think that is a good positive thing. It will of course be good news for agents but then good landlords are already using agents, either in the drafting of their contracts or the finding of their tenants, the vetting of their tenants, all of those things already. Of course it is a case for lawyers of heads they win, tails they win as well because there is a new piece of legislation and, again, good landlords will consult their lawyers to make sure that they are complying with this change in legislation. I find myself in Third Reading really hoping that there is a recognition in this Assembly and, therefore, in the wider community, that this will not have terrible detrimental economic impacts to our economy but it will have effects upon our economy. As the economic impact assessment said, we cannot be absolutely sure what those will be. Will it have impacts upon the number of rental properties available in Jersey? Some landlords have told us that they will exit the market and we have heard other evidence, but we cannot be absolutely certain. Because, again, corporates might pick up some of those properties and run them in a different way. We do not know that. But if those things do happen, then tenants will not see the benefits either that have been ascribed to this legislation. What they will see, those tenants who are already with those landlords who are practising like this already, in effect, they will see very little change. They will see an annual increase in line with inflation, which is already today in lots of people's contracts. I think, as I said yesterday, what really does worry me though is those tenants right now who have no contract - that worries me - and those tenants who do not feel empowered to have a dialogue with their landlord. I do not see anything in this legislation that deals with that. But what that does suggest to me is that there does need to be - and I am not sure how the Minister is going to deal with this - more compliance work. Because it should not be in today's society that tenants in Jersey do not have a contract. Okay, sometimes contracts take a little bit longer than when one has moved in to be delivered. But as a general per se people should not be going in a situation without contracts. I think there is questions about compliance. We can say there is no additional red tape or no additional bureaucracy because the burden to change the contract is placed on the landlord, and that is not necessarily a bad thing. But there will need to end up being better policing, not only of this approach but the existing requirements within the law on landlords. I suppose the reason I do or am concerned about a contraction in the rental market, if that is to take place or does take place and, as we say, we cannot be absolutely certain that it might, the reason I am concerned about that is because we have other housing and controls in place, which means that those people who come to our community are not empowered to buy in the marketplace; they have no choice but to be in rental accommodation. We might find that, as this law takes effect, we have to revisit some of those issues and situations as well. I suppose having fought the introduction of rent controls within this piece of legislation, I do want to say to landlords and I think that the ... I have forgotten what they call themselves now, Jersey Landlords Association, there are some up in the gallery. I hope that as this law passes, because I think it will today, I hope that they will feel empowered to work with the Minister and his officials. If he is not doing it ... we can see they are just sat along the gallery from him, so they can start that work as soon as the vote has taken place. To seek to send a message to their members and to landlords that there is a way through this and that they should maintain their property because they are doing a good for the community, providing rental accommodation when we have legislation and controls in place that say people have to come to Jersey and rent, private

landlords are doing a good for the community and we should not forget that. I know that most Members do not. Landlords that are currently raising their rents by R.P.I. every year and all landlords want to maintain their tenants in place because that is what the income stream is, and that is what allows them to provide the funding for repairs and the return and all those things, they will be able to continue. They will, to some extent, maybe in some cases benefit from extended tenancies for all the reasons that we know are in the law.

[12:15]

I also think there is comfort for some of those landlords in that there is now the amendment that allows for a 12-month notice period without condition that was not there before. I think that is also an improvement. You are wondering which way I am going to go, having voted against virtually everything up until this point. But I just want to put some of that into context; it is a different law from the one that was initially lodged. I do not think it will do all the things that some Members have articulated they think it will do, nor do I think now in its current state, is it quite as terrible as it was initially? I personally, fundamentally, do not think that rent control is a good intervention in the market, but I have lost those arguments now on 3 or 4 occasions, as with others, during the course of this debate, and that is where we find ourselves. I think the Minister and I are often opposed ideologically to issues, but I can see that he has been pragmatic in the acceptance of amendments, even on the floor of the Assembly, to improve the law, because, as the Connétable of St. John said earlier, there are some good things in this law which we would want to keep. So, I find myself in Third Reading, ultimately still not being happy with rent control, but not necessarily wanting to block the good things. We will have to wait and see which way my finger wobbles when the voting is open.

2.1.23 Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour:

We are voting today on the final amended Tenancy Law. I am even more reassured now with all the constructive amendments passed, this law is balanced and measured. It protects tenants while respecting landlords with the main concerns highlighted during scrutiny, addressed through the amendments. I believe this law does not weaken our traditions; it strengthens them. A fair contract in our tradition is one where both sides have proportionate, balanced rights and responsibilities, and in my opinion, this law brings it. No one denies the important contribution landlords make to our housing system. The many landlords who provide safe, well-maintained homes and support our communities, often going above and beyond to make housing work for everyone, like my landlord, deserve recognition. They should generally have no reason to worry or see changes in the way they operate as a result of this law passing. At the same time, we must be honest. There are also landlords who fail to meet their responsibilities, sometimes intentionally, and tenants need protection to ensure their homes remain safe and secure. To say that all those proved lived experiences of tenancy problems highlighted in speeches during the debate do not exist, there is no clear data on how many, is disrespectful. For even more reassurance, I want to clarify that what we are voting on today does not include the civil penalty regime or the detailed rules of the Rent Tribunal. Those will come later through secondary legislation. There will be full scrutiny, full debate, and full Assembly involvement before any of that comes into place. Members should feel confident there is plenty of time to shape those details. To say this framework creates bureaucracy or burdens landlords with red tape is simply wrong. Landlords are understandably worried because of false information being spread on and on. People may reasonably disagree on the balance of property rights, but our debate should be based on truth, not exaggerated claims about red tape that do not exist. In reality, the framework creates no extra paperwork, no permissions, no fees, and no new dealings with the Government whatsoever. The existing tenancy will continue the same until the contract expires and smooth transition is considered in the law. What the law establishes is clear, passive standards that function in the background. It is not red tape, it is reason. We are also being told repeatedly about the supposed £300 per year extra cost for landlords if this passes. Did anyone ask what is this considered for? I

did. It is a theoretical cost estimated for the time landlords might spend familiarising themselves with the new laws. Would you not expect in any job with any new law to read what is new? But there is just reading it, understanding it, and that is it. Perhaps after reading it, they will see that this law is far less worrying than the misinformation, intentional or not, has made it seem. The Minister has also promised a clear guidance will be published on the changes, and I am sure anyone can continue to contact the Housing Department for any information or advice they need. What is at stake today is something simple but vital. Giving tenants more stability and security in their homes, protecting the most vulnerable who cannot stand up for themselves in unfair situations on both sides, without stripping landlords of a fair return on their investment. This is not extreme. It is reasonable, it is responsible, it is the right next step. As someone once said, the strength of a community is measured by the safety of its home. Let us give people who do not own their home that security too, and do so fairly, reasonably, and together. Because at the end of the day, a home is not just a building, it is where memories are made, where families grow, and where communities thrive. Let us make sure our law protects all of that. Please support this proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff:

I call upon the Minister to reply.

2.1.24 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South:

Can I thank Members for all of their contributions and their resilience through what has been a long and at some points complicated debate, and, Sir, can I thank you for chairing this, and the Greffe team for all of their work and advice in helping us know where we are along the way. Of course, too, to the Attorney General for his help when Members have had technical questions. There are some more people who I will thank, but I will save that for a little bit later. Because of the process that we have gone through in the last few days, we now have a law that is stronger than where we started. I am so grateful to those who brought those amendments to help us get there, to all of those who provided me with advice and counsel along the way, including the Chief Minister who has been supportive of this throughout, and I am grateful to him for that. I hope Members will recognise the fact that I have moved around on some of these issues and listened to Members, trying to be accommodating in the interests of progress, and that is pragmatism over purity to maximise our chances of getting the best outcome for the Island at the end of this. Scrutiny did an outstanding job, and listening to the chair of the panel's speech just before, I almost wished I could have delegated this closing speech to her because of how clear and comprehensive she was. But we have now landed at a package that works. It is not a Frankenstein law, or a zombie law, or vampire law, or xenomorph law, or any other thing we may have risked along the way. When we get to this part of the debate, of course, I accept that most Members will have made up their minds, and so I will attempt some final comments that maybe anyone who remains with any misgivings, and I would say to those that we do have a balanced piece of legislation before us, having been enhanced along the way by those amendments. It is noticeable that even in the last point of this debate, when those who did speak against it did so, they were still not citing specific provisions and changes that gave them reasons to feel negative. It was all big picture, holistic, rather than what actual provision they think would be harmful. I think the reason for that is because when you look at the proposed detail, and what changes come into force as a result, they are pretty modest. No new forms, no new fees, no new permissions. The proposed enhancements to tenants' rights are balanced with enhancements to landlords' rights too. I do want to say to Deputy Howell, who mentioned a landlord she had spoken to in tears, that obviously I feel bad about that. I do not want anybody to feel anxiety or worry over this. The only tears that I am working towards are my own, hopefully with happiness, if this is adopted, and there is a serious risk of that. But what I would say to Deputies and Constables who meet these people at their constituency surgeries, please feel free to send those people to me because I will do everything I can to reassure them. I remember early on in this process I had a brief interaction with a landlord who came up to say hello to me at the yacht club. This gentleman approached me, he was perfectly

nice and polite, he recognised who I was and what I was doing and wished me luck, but said that he would not be supporting the rent proposals because he and his wife owned a rental property and they intended later on in their life that they would move into that property when it became appropriate for them in their later years, and if my proposals went through they would not be able to do that, and so they would have to think about selling. I got to say to this landlord: "Well, there is a very clear provision in what I am proposing that says you will be able to issue notice to your tenant in that circumstance because you are using it for yourself, and I am absolutely crystal clear about that." This landlord looked at me and he went: "Right, okay, brilliant. We will crack on then." It literally took me 30 seconds to reassure this person who was worried, and we will see more and more of that if the law is adopted. I am not going to dwell too much on the economic impact assessment email because Deputy Renouf, I think, said most of what needed to be said on it. But just to say to Members that that was not my document. I did not commission it, and I did not see it until late in the day, and I have got plenty of questions about it too, including all of the stuff that was missing from it. Most importantly, an examination of the counterfactual, the do-nothing option, and what impact leaving those loopholes open in our law and having our framework for renting falling behind our competitor jurisdictions will have, and the prospect of our young workers feeling the need to leave the Island in search of a better life elsewhere. But I will highlight to Members the document that I sent around on Tuesday morning, 28 pages long, comprehensive and published in the public domain, which was done during the policy development stage where it ought to be, rather than a retrospective look at proposals I had already committed to for predetermined ideological reasons. That economic exercise was done specifically to inform my proposals, and I did move my positions as a result of the advice that we got through that, which I think is the right way to do things. If this law is adopted in Third Reading, I will do everything I can to make it work. There are still bits that will need to come to the Assembly, and I will engage with Members and with Scrutiny to get all of those things right. That will, at some point, when that is done, lead to an enactment of the law, which this gets at Deputy Gardiner's question, which I would love to be in a position to do it before the end of this term, but if that is not possible because of the length of time it takes to do on those secondary things, then it is something officers can work on over purdah and that can be picked up by the new Government. But when we know what we are dealing with, we will be able to crack on with a proper communications mission now. Guidance will be an extremely important part of that, and we had experience of that recently with the rented dwellings licensing scheme, and we should note in that, that though the public meetings and one-to-one advice that was provided through that went down very well, the guidance document itself did not land well because there was a feeling it was presented in a confusing way, and we can learn the lessons from that and make sure we do a better job of it this time round. If the Assembly approve this, I will look forward to that piece of work. Deputy Doublet asked about how this impact would be measured, and that goes to a Scrutiny recommendation who are recommending that we commit to doing some sort of exercise on that. We already have things that will help us in doing that. The house price index quarterly review is part of that, and they have recently started catching statistics on rental properties bought and sold. We now are starting to get that data, which is helpful. But as a result of this law, we will begin capturing data on rents charged. The Rent Tribunal will do an annual report, and all of that will help feed into that, and the law is future-proofed in that it has regulation-making abilities for this Assembly to change things if we think evidence is presented that things could be tweaked. But Deputy Doublet also asked about middle Jersey and how this would affect them, people who do not themselves own rental properties. The thing I would say to people who own a home and have children and are living an ordinary life in Jersey, what is the most important thing to those people? The most important thing above all else to those people will be their children, and it will be what they think the prospects of their children are to live happy and prosperous lives. If Jersey does not provide the foundations from which people can live those decent and happy lives here in the form of a home which is affordable, secure and safe to them, we will not be able to blame anyone but ourselves for not realising why many of those children when they become adults will choose to leave in search of better lives elsewhere. I do not

believe I should say much more on this. The only final point I wanted to make was to thank my team who have worked tirelessly behind the scenes on this and I remain in absolute awe of their professionalism, commitment and sheer intellect. They deserve medals for working with me. But in the absence of that, I certainly owe each of them a drink, and now that I have committed that to Hansard there is no way I can back out of that. So, I thank them very deeply for the work that they have done on this outstanding piece of work that will make a difference to the lives of people in Jersey. So, I commend this law in Third Reading and call for the appel.

[12:30]

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Can I have a point of clarification, please?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

Yes.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Thank you, Minister, for answering my question. Just to ensure, because this law can be enacted by the order, did I understand correct that Minister needs to come back to the Assembly with the regulation, and law will not be enacted by an order without coming back to the Assembly?

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

That is correct. It would not work without those regulations done first.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. All Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I announce that the law has been adopted in Third Reading:

POUR: 31		CONTRE: 13		ABSTAIN: 1
Connétable of St. Helier		Connétable of St. Clement		Deputy I.J. Gorst
Connétable of St. Lawrence		Connétable of Grouville		
Connétable of St. Brelade		Deputy C.F. Labey		
Connétable of Trinity		Deputy S.G. Luce		
Connétable of St. Peter		Deputy K.F. Morel		
Connétable of St. Martin		Deputy S.M. Ahier		
Connétable of St. John		Deputy D.J. Warr		
Connétable of St. Ouen		Deputy M.R. Scott		
Connétable of St. Mary		Deputy R.E. Binet		
Connétable of St. Saviour		Deputy A. Howell		
Deputy G.P. Southern		Deputy T.J.A. Binet		
Deputy M. Tadier		Deputy B. Ward		
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet		Deputy K.M. Wilson		
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				

Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Do you want the names?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Yes, Sir, I think it has been a request for all of the votes.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Those members voting pour: the Connétables of St. Helier, St. Lawrence, St. Brelade, Trinity, St. Peter, St. Martin, St. John, St. Ouen, St. Mary, and St. Saviour, and Deputies Southern, Tadier, Doublet, Le Hegarat, Rob Ward, Gardiner, Farnham, Mézec, Miles, Renouf, Catherine Curtis, Feltham, Jeune, Millar, Ferey, Kovacs, Andrews, Coles, Stephenson, Alves, and Porée. Those members voting contre: the Connétables of St. Clement and Grouville, and Deputies Labey, Morel, Ahier, Warr, Scott, Rose Binet, Howell, Tom Binet, Barbara Ward, Wilson, and Luce. Deputy Gorst abstained.

3. Draft Income Support (Parents, Children and Housing) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.59/2025)

The Deputy Bailiff:

The next item is the Draft Income Support (Parents, Children and Housing) Amendment Regulations lodged by the Minister for Social Security. The main respondent is the chair of the Health and Social Scrutiny Panel. I will ask the Greffier to read the citation.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

Draft Income Support (Parents, Children and Housing) (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202-. The States make these Regulations under Articles 5 and 18 of the Income Support (Jersey) Law 2007.

3.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

I promise Members this will be a lot more straightforward than the last item. Income support has been in administration since 2008, and since that time it has been evolving to keep up with the wide and varying range of people's circumstances. The changes proposed appear complex and technical but, in reality, will simply ensure the law remains current and enable more efficient administration and appropriate data collection. The changes are not contentious and will have no negative impact

on income support claimants. The addendum that I have provided sets out more clearly what the changes mean and has been shared to provide some extra background and context to Members about what might happen in different circumstances. There are 3 main areas of change proposed. The first area deals with family units. The proposed regulations make the definition of family unit clearer. In general terms, a young person who lives with their parents will be included as part of the income support household of the parents until they are 25 years old. The regulation also proposes the entitlement to the single parent component is determined against the family unit instead of the household. This ensures the component can be awarded in cases where a young family member has their own claim. It ensures the single parents of young people with high care needs are treated the same as other single parents. These changes reflect current operational process. There will be no change in entitlement to income support claimants. The second area of change relates to the award of accommodation component. The proposed regulations will allow rent to be recognised for a parent or their son or daughter who is eligible for income support but not named on the lease or licence of the family dwelling. The proposals also amend the calculation of the amount of accommodation component payable when more than one household shares a dwelling to ensure income support is not over or underpaying in certain circumstances. The law draft has taken the opportunity to tidy up this section of the regulations, so while the rates for all housing components available to income support households are part of the revised schedule 1, there are no changes proposed to their values. These will be reviewed again as part of the annual review in January 2026 as usual. These changes in respect of the accommodation component reflect current operational processes. There will be no change of entitlements to income support claimants. The final area of change relates to the treatment of young people with earnings. The proposals aim to incentivise young people to work by ensuring they and their families will always be better off while they are earning. The changes reflect current operational process. There will be no negative change in entitlement to income support claimants. There is a proposed amendment to the student earnings threshold to set it at the point the young person will be better off by having earnings disregarded in lieu of receiving income support components. A very small number of claims could be slightly better off as a result of these changes. But this is appropriate because the new threshold will ensure the student and their family are always better off by the young person working. In summary and before closing, these changes are required to ensure that the law remains current and to enable more efficient administration and appropriate data collection, which can be delivered as part of our wider transform programme. I make the proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are the principles seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the principles?

3.1.1 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

I wish to draw Members' attention to my panel's comments on this proposition, and the panel is supportive of the proposition. But the Minister mentioned that they appeared complex and technical, and I can certainly agree with that. I want to thank my officer and the Minister's officers for the work that was done in helping us to fully understand the implications of this proposition so that we could issue these comments. I just wanted to highlight 2 things that personally I feel are really notable. Focusing on young people and encouraging them to be able to work, I think that is really important, is it not, that their families are not impacted by that? That was highlighted, I believe, in the C.R.I.A. (Children's Right Impact Assessment) as well, so fully supportive of that. Also, the single parents not being disadvantaged when they have a child who is receiving the care component. This is something that is going to make a huge change for people who are in that situation, and it might seem like it is small technical amendments today, but I think there will be a group of people in our Island for whom this will have a huge impact, certainly for those single parents who are caring for children with disabilities or additional needs, and I am sure that they will be very grateful to the

Minister for making these amendments. So, the panel is in support of all of the amendments within the proposition.

3.1.2 Deputy H.M. Miles of St. Brelade:

I have read both of these amendments with interest, and I agree with Deputy Doublet when she says that they are extraordinarily complicated. So, I just have a couple of areas of clarification that I would appreciate if the Minister would address when she is summing up. The first one specifically refers to young people in full-time education and working. Does this now apply to distance learning students who now get maintenance grants? I would like to know how income support will treat them compared to students who are off-Island in full-time education, and have the distance learning students been considered at all in this amendment? Will they also have a work requirement, because their study is not necessarily full-time? If there is a work requirement, how will those hours of study be apportioned against the maintenance grant for income support claims and hours of work? I would also like to know whether the work disregard will be applied if students are studying for a key skills course. Moving to example 5 in the regulations, and I appreciate these are technical issues, but I think they are important questions. While I understand why the Minister is changing this, might it have unintended consequences? Students who remain off-Island during their university holidays seem to me will get to keep all of their income, but if they come back to Jersey to work, they will not. I would like some clarification on that. The other clarification is something that I have raised in the Assembly before, and that is the issue of adult children who are on income support living with their parents in households who are not income support households. I refer specifically to young adults who may have autism or severe learning disabilities, who currently are not entitled to a housing component. I have read and re-read this, and whereas I can see it applies where parents are on income support, I cannot see that it applies if they are not. My final question: will these changes regarding family units and households be applied automatically by her department, or will the claimants need to make a new claim in order to benefit from any changes?

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on the principles? I call upon the Minister to reply.

3.1.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Scrutiny Panel for its report and its work over the summer recess to understand this change in legislation and see that what we are doing is a fairly straightforward tidying-up exercise. In relation to the questions that the Deputy asked in relation to distance learning and very specific things. Firstly, there is not a requirement to work within this legislation. What we are saying is it is encouraging young people to work and enabling them to be better off when they do that. With regard to young adults that are not entitled within a household, some of this, again, we try and treat people as we give them the best option that is going to work for their household in order to give the better entitlement. That is the intention of this particular change in legislation. I am always hesitant to give advice on specific circumstances on the floor of the Chamber because it is really important, and I know some of these questions have been raised by the student loan support group as well. The advice I always give to them is that people should contact the department in relation to their specific circumstance in order to get the correct advice in relation to their circumstance. But the changes to students apply to students in full-time education, including that on and off-Island, and students in receipt of the grants will only be considered for being in the household when they are not eligible for the grant. So, they either get the grant or they get their income support, if that makes sense. I am happy to speak with the Deputy about any further areas or any specific cases that she is concerned about. But I would like to give assurance to everybody that this is about putting into law what is common and custom practice within the department. This is about ensuring that people are always treated in the best and most appropriate way, and this is about

efficiency and effectiveness, and ensuring that we can do things as quickly as possible. I know there was another question around automatic.

[12.45]

Of course, whenever anybody's situation changes, they need to inform the department of their changing circumstances. We do not have automated processes within government departments where, say, for example, C.Y.P.E.S. (Children, Young People, Education and Skills) would let us know when somebody becomes a student. I really must remind people that when their circumstances change, and that may have an impact on their eligibility for income support, they do need to contact the department in order to get the right advice. I think that answers the questions, so I will call for the appel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. All Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the principles have been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 45		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				

Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

Deputy Doublet, does your Panel wish to scrutinise this matter?

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs):

No, thank you, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Minister, how do you propose the regulations in Second Reading?

3.2 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

En bloc, please, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are the regulations seconded? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations in Second Reading? All those in favour, kindly show. Thank you very much. Those against? The regulations are adopted in Second Reading. Minister, do you wish to propose the matter in Third Reading?

3.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Yes, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the matter seconded in Third Reading? **[Seconded]** Does anyone wish to speak on the regulations as adopted in Third Reading? Is the appel called for? In that case, all those in favour, kindly show.

Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Appel, please, Sir.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I invite the Greffier to open the voting. All Members have had the opportunity of casting their votes. I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the regulations have been adopted unanimously in Third Reading:

POUR: 45		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Lawrence				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				
Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				

Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

4. Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal: Appointment of Members (P.60/2025)

The Deputy Bailiff:

The final item is Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal: Appointment of Members, lodged by the Minister for Social Security. The main respondent is the chair of the Health and Social Security Scrutiny Panel. I ask the Greffier to read the proposition.

The Deputy Greffier of the States:

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion – to appoint, in accordance with the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Jersey) Regulations 2014, the following persons as members of the Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal, for a period of 5 years – Employee Panel lay members: Alison Brown, James Thompson, Grzegorz Lukowski, Robert Douglas. Employer Panel lay members: James Lambert, Josephine Scott, Lisa Payn, Simon Soar. Discrimination Panel lay members: Pioneny Colville, Rhodrick Chatikobo, Sabrina Stewart, Wali Ul Islam.

4.1 Deputy L.V. Feltham of St. Helier Central (The Minister for Social Security):

I am pleased to seek the approval of the Assembly to the appointment of 12 new lay members to the Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal. What is particularly encouraging, as Members will see from my report, is the breadth of experience and interests of the new appointees, reflecting a wide cross-section of the community in Jersey. If the proposition is agreed to, the appointments will take effect once the new members have taken the oath before the Royal Court. I am satisfied that the recruitment process undertaken with the participation of the Jersey Appoints Commission was carried out in a fair and transparent way. I make the proposition.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Is the proposition seconded? Does any member wish to speak on the proposition?

4.1.1 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

I speak partly with my chair of the Jersey Human Rights Group, not necessarily something directly related to this Assembly, but we know that in Jersey issues of discrimination still have a long way to go. I noticed in today's *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* that there was another case of somebody who faced discrimination in a pub. I think the pub was in St. Martin. That they were not served, and it

turns out that they had a particular condition which the server did not know, and they won their tribunal and were awarded, it has been reported, a sum of £2,500. On the top of the story that was run yesterday, and that has been raised here with the Minister, I think it is absolutely right that on occasions we do bring these cases to the attention of Government, especially where there are companies running monopolies on behalf of Government for key infrastructure in the Island, that it is really important that we have a tribunal that can make impartial and measured decisions on these things. From what it looks like in front of us, with that balance of both lay members from employers, employees, but also discrimination panel lay members, that we should be able to get to hopefully a position. What I would emphasise though - I had a conversation outside of the Assembly - is that so many of these cases simply do not come to the tribunal anyway because members of the public who have faced discrimination in all sorts of ways - we talked about disability discrimination - even when there has been a tangible and obvious bad practice intentionally or otherwise, those on the receiving end of that so often do not want to make a fuss. They often say: "We simply want to make sure that this kind of behaviour does not happen again." Of course that is a matter for them. Ultimately, we do need cases to come forward to go to tribunal, not just to set precedence but also to make sure that there is some kind of justice and retribution. But we cannot enforce individuals to do that. So, I do of course congratulate the Minister for bringing this forward and putting together - not herself - but the process seems to have solicited responses from a diverse background, and I wish the panel all the best in their difficult deliberations.

4.1.2 Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour:

Two very brief points. First of all, to thank the Minister for the level of detail, which helps us to understand that there is diversity among these appointments, which is very helpful. Secondly, Members will see in the financial and staffing implications, it is stated as none because the remuneration comes from the budget of the Judicial Greffier. I did look into this and the fees are, I believe, £800 a day for the chair and vice-chair posts, £300 a day for lay members. It would be helpful if this information could be included in future appointment propositions, because I think it is important that the Assembly is aware of that at the time of lodging.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Does anyone else wish to speak on this proposition? I call upon the Minister to reply.

4.1.3 Deputy L.V. Feltham:

Like Deputy Tadier, I also do hope that more people take the opportunity to take cases, where there are genuine cases that need to be heard, to the tribunal and use that service as appropriate. Yes, to Deputy Doublet, thank you for your support there, and I will ask officers in the future to include that information, because I think it is useful for Members to know that there is that remuneration as well. I close and call for the appel.

The Deputy Bailiff:

The appel has been called for. Members are invited to return to their seats. I ask the Greffier to open the voting. If all Members have the opportunity to cast their votes, I ask the Greffier to close the voting. I can announce that the proposition has been adopted unanimously:

POUR: 44		CONTRE: 0		ABSTAIN: 0
Connétable of St. Helier				
Connétable of St. Brelade				
Connétable of Trinity				
Connétable of St. Peter				
Connétable of St. Martin				

Connétable of St. John				
Connétable of St. Clement				
Connétable of Grouville				
Connétable of St. Ouen				
Connétable of St. Mary				
Connétable of St. Saviour				
Deputy G.P. Southern				
Deputy C.F. Labey				
Deputy M. Tadier				
Deputy S.G. Luce				
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet				
Deputy K.F. Morel				
Deputy M.R. Le Hegarat				
Deputy S.M. Ahier				
Deputy R.J. Ward				
Deputy C.S. Alves				
Deputy I. Gardiner				
Deputy I.J. Gorst				
Deputy L.J. Farnham				
Deputy S.Y. Mézec				
Deputy T.A. Coles				
Deputy B.B. de S.V.M. Porée				
Deputy D.J. Warr				
Deputy H.M. Miles				
Deputy M.R. Scott				
Deputy J. Renouf				
Deputy C.D. Curtis				
Deputy L.V. Feltham				
Deputy R.E. Binet				
Deputy H.L. Jeune				
Deputy M.E. Millar				
Deputy A. Howell				
Deputy T.J.A. Binet				
Deputy M.R. Ferey				
Deputy R.S. Kovacs				
Deputy B. Ward				
Deputy K.M. Wilson				
Deputy L.K.F. Stephenson				
Deputy M.B. Andrews				

ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Deputy Bailiff:

That concludes Public Business for this meeting. I invite the chair of P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) to propose the arrangement of public business for future meetings.

5. Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North (Chair, Privileges and Procedures Committee):

There are a couple of changes from the listing of public business as shown on the Consolidated Order Paper. Members will recall that the Minister for the Environment deferred P.53 Draft Sea Fisheries (Minimum Size Limits) from this meeting to the next, and that has therefore been added to the list for the meeting of 30th September. Deputy Miles has advised that her 2 propositions, P.67 Les Quennevais Parade and Precinct, and P.68 vacant commercial properties, will be listed for the meeting on 21st October, and they will not therefore be debated next time. Finally, the Draft Competition Amendment Law, which was lodged yesterday, P.69, is listed for the meeting on 11th November. Looking at the amount of business for the next meeting, I do not anticipate it to be lasting as long as this week, but I would advise Members to be mindful of the continuation days and try to make themselves available. Therefore, I propose the business.

The Deputy Bailiff:

Are Members content to proceed as recommended by the chair of P.P.C.? Are Members are now content to adjourn? The States stands adjourned until 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 30th September.

ADJOURNMENT

[12:58]